

THE PURĀṆA TEXT
OF THE
DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

EDITED BY

F. E. PARGITER, M.A.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, RETIRED : LATE JUDGE, HIGH COURT, CALCUTTA

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE AND BOMBAY

1913

OXFORD: HORACE HART
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	V
The Purāṇa authorities, §§ 1, 2.	
The Versions and their characters, §§ 3-6.	
The Bhaviṣya Purāṇa the original authority, §§ 7-9.	
Prophetic form of the account, §§ 10-11.	
Original language of the account, §§ 15-17.	
Age of the compilation of the account— from its subject-matter, §§ 18-25 ; from the scripts, §§ 26, 27.	
Sanskritization of the account, §§ 28, 29.	
Errors, omissions, and rare verses, §§ 30, 31.	
Formation of this text, §§ 32-36.	
Interpretation of the account—generally, §§ 37, 38 ; misreadings of letters, §§ 39-41 ; numerals, §§ 42-47.	
Conclusion, §§ 48-54.	
List of Authorities: editions and MSS collated	xxix
Abbreviations	xxxiv
THE PURĀṆA TEXT OF THE DYNASTIES—	
Preface	1
Pauravas (of Hastināpura and Kauśāmbī)	3
Aikṣvākus (of Ayodhyā)	8
Bārhadrathas (of Magadha)	13
Pradyotas	17
Śiśunāgas	20
Early Contemporary Dynasties	23
Nandas	24
Mauryas	26
Śuṅgas	30

	PAGE
Kāṇvāyanas (Śaṅgabhṛtyas)	33
Andhras	35
Various Local Dynasties	44
Dynasties of Vidiṣā, &c.	48
Dynasties of the Third Century, A.D.	50
Contemporary Dynasties of the early Fourth Century	53
Evils of the Kali Age	55
Chronological and Astronomical Particulars	57
TRANSLATION	65
APPENDICES—	
I. The Account was originally in Prakrit	77
II. The oldest scripts used in the Account	84
III. Janamejaya's dispute with the brahmins	86
INDEX	89

INTRODUCTION

Authorities.

Accounts of the dynasties that reigned in India during the Kali age are found in the Matsya, Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata, Garuḍa, and Bhaviṣya Purāṇas. All these, except the Matsya and Bhāgavata, set out the ancient genealogies down to the time of the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, and immediately afterwards deal with the dynasties that reigned in North India after that time, of which the three earliest and chief were the Pauravas who reigned at first at Hastināpura and moved in king Nicakṣus' time to Kauśāmbī, the Aikṣvākus who reigned at Ayodhyā, and the Bārhadrathas who reigned in Magadha. But the Matsya and Bhāgavata break these up. The Matsya adds only these later Pauravas to the ancient Paurava line in connexion with the ancient genealogies, and introduces all the rest of the Kali age dynasties separately in some of its latest chapters. The Bhāgavata adds the later Aikṣvākus to the ancient line, and the later Pauravas and Bārhadrathas¹ immediately after the ancient Paurava line in its ninth skandha, and deals with all the subsequent dynasties separately in its twelfth skandha.

2. The editions cited in this Introduction are these :—

Matsya and Vāyu, Ānandaśrama editions of 1907 and 1905 (cited as *AMt* and *AVā*).

Brahmāṇḍa, Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara edition of 1906 (cited as *Bd*).

Bhāgavata, Gaṇpat Kṛishṇāji edition of 1889 (cited as *GBh*)².

Viṣṇu and Garuḍa, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgar's Calcutta editions of 1882 and 1890 (cited as *CVs* and *CGr*).

The only copy of the Bhaviṣya that I have seen, containing the dynastic matter, is the Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara edition.

The passages containing this dynastic matter are these³ :—

AMatsya 50, 57-89, and 271, 1 to 273, 55.

AVāyu 99, 250-435.

Brahmāṇḍa iii, 74, 104-248.

¹ The Bārhadratha line was an offshoot from the Paurava line; see *JRAS*, 1910, pp. 11, 22, 29, 51.

² The edition begun by Burnouf cannot be adopted for reference, because it does not contain the Sanskrit text of skandha xii.

³ The first few kings of the future Pauravas are named in *MBh* i, 95, 3835-8 (which agrees with these authorities); and also in *Brahma* 13, 123-141, and *Harivamśa* 191, 11063-81 (which are wholly unlike these authorities and are obviously absurd).

CViṣṇu iv, 20, 12 to 24, 44.

GBhāgavata ix, 12, 9-16; 22, 34-49; and xii, 1, 2 to 2, 36.

CGaruda 140, 40 and 141, 1-12.

Bhaviṣya III, i, 3 and 6.

The accounts are in verse in the śloka metre in all except the Viṣṇu, which is mainly in prose except in the final portion.

The Versions and their Characters.

3. The versions of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa present a remarkable similarity. The two latter agree so closely that they resemble two recensions of the same text, and the Matsya, though not in such marked agreement, contains a text very similar. There can be no doubt that their versions are based upon one original compilation, and this appears from four facts: *first*, they all declare they are taken from the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa¹; *secondly*, where the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa differ from each other, one of them not seldom agrees with the Matsya²; *thirdly*, single MSS of them sometimes vary so as to agree with the reading of the Matsya³; and *fourthly*, one Purāṇa occasionally omits a verse which appears in one or both of the two others, yet a single MS (or a very few MSS) of it has at times preserved that verse⁴ and so testifies to their original harmony. These three versions therefore grew out of one and the same original text. At the same time the Matsya version has a character of its own which is clearly different from those of the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, and was prior to those two (see § 24). The similarity of the three is however such that, by collating all their MSS, copious material is available for estimating what the original compilation was. The verse is almost epic. One line is generally assigned to each king, and two or more are sometimes given to the more prominent kings; and it is rare that two kings are dealt with in the same line, except in the early portions of the Paurava, Aikṣvāku, and Bārhadratha dynasties for which the chroniclers' materials were necessarily scanty, and in the latest dynasties which are treated succinctly.

4. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have very much in common and their versions are generally alike, with the differences that the latter is in verse and the former in prose, and that the latter by the exigencies of its metre has less freedom and is often cramped. Both are distinguished from the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa in being much condensed, so that their accounts are often little more than a string of names fitted in with connecting words and occasional terms of relationship; yet they vary at times in important names and particulars so far as to indicate some independence. The Viṣṇu has ślokas at the end of the Paurava and Aikṣvāku dynasties, and the

¹ See § 7.

² Thus the Vāyu agrees with the Matsya in p. 17, l. 32; and the Brahmāṇḍa with the Matsya in p. 22, l. 13. Other instances will be found in the notes.

³ Especially eVā; as to which see *List of Authorities: Vāyu*.

⁴ Thus p. 28, ll. 3, 4 of the Matsya version do not occur in any copy of the Vāyu or Brahmāṇḍa except eVā.

whole of its final, chronological and astronomical portion is in verse ; and it cites all these as pre-existing ślokas. The Bhāgavata has at times fuller verses which resemble those of the three Purāṇas, and its final portion agrees largely with that of the Viṣṇu. Wherever the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have the fuller form of verse, they agree with or approximate to the version of those three Purāṇas, and so testify that they have been derived from an original which was the same as or closely like the original of those Purāṇas. These peculiarities show that these two are condensed reductions. They are also later, for the Viṣṇu elaborates its prose at times in the ornate classical style especially when referring to Kṛṣṇa-Viṣṇu¹, and the age of the Bhāgavata will be considered further on².

5. The Garuḍa stands by itself, for it gives only the Paurava, Aikṣvāku, and Bārhadratha dynasties, and its account of them is merely a string of bare names put into ślokas, more condensed than the Bhāgavata. It is evidently a late version ; see Appendix I, § x.

6. The only copy of the Bhaviṣya which contains this dynastic matter is the Venkateṣvara edition, but its account is altogether vitiated and worthless. It says each Paurava king reigned at least 1000 years, and Kṣemaka's son was Pradyota (IPI, i, 3, 82-96) ; and it declares that Gautama founded Buddhism in Mahānanda's time, that Gautama reigned ten years, and that his successors were Śākyamuni, Śuddhodana, Śākyasimha, his son Buddhasimha, and his son Candragupta (ibid. 6, 35-43). It dilates, however, on more recent 'history' with elaborate details, and with a great quantity of new matter boldly fabricated brings its prophecies down to the nineteenth century³. In other copies the ancient matter has dropped out, and some very modern events have been particularized⁴.

The Bhaviṣya the Original Authority.

7. The Bhaviṣya is declared to have been the original authority for these dynasties. Both the Matsya and the Vāyu expressly state that their accounts are based upon it. Thus in the Preface the Sūta says he will declare all the future kings—

tān sarvān kīrtayisyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān.

* This is the Matsya version, and the Vāyu, agreeing, makes it more precise by reading *Bhaviṣye kathitān*⁵. Here *Bhaviṣye* cannot mean simply 'in the future', but must mean 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa'. Again, when mentioning the Paurava kings after Adhisimakṣma's reign, the Sūta introduces them with a verse, of which the second line runs thus according to the Matsya :—

tasyānvavāye vakṣyāmi Bhaviṣye kathitān nṛpān.

¹ It alludes to Kṛṣṇa thus :—Bhagavataḥ saha-sa-surāsura-vandita-carāṇa-yugalasyāt-mēcchā-karāṇa-mānuṣa-rūpa-dhāriṇo 'nubhāvāt (iv, 20, 12).

² See Appendix I, § viii, and Appendix II.

³ See ZDMG, lyii, 276.

⁴ See *List of Authorities: Bhaviṣya*, *infra*.

⁵ See p. 2, l. 7 and notes thereto. The Bāhmānda no doubt had the same line, but it has a large lacuna (see p. 1) and the line has been lost. On the importance of these words see § 23.

The Vāyu agrees, except that it reads *Bhaviṣye tāvato*¹. The Matsya words can mean nothing but 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa', and this is the best rendering of the Vāyu's words also, even if *tāvato* be not a misreading².

8. Again, when citing the genealogical śloka at the end of the Aikṣvāku dynasty, the Vāyu says it was *bhaviṣya-jñair udāhṛtaḥ*, and the Brahmāṇḍa *bhaviṣyaj-jñair udāhṛtaḥ*, but the Matsya says truthfully *riprair gītaḥ purāṇanaiḥ*. Here *bhaviṣya* and *bhaviṣyat* can hardly mean 'future' because the plural is used. Vyāsa alone was supposed to be gifted with foreknowledge, and those men could only repeat what they received from him; but, as the Sūta says he got his knowledge from Vyāsa directly (p. 2), it was futile for him to refer to them as authorities. The best interpretation therefore is that *bhaviṣya* means the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa, and that *bhaviṣyat* is a perversion of it. Lastly, in the concluding portion of this account of the Kali age the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa have this line generally:—

Bhaviṣye te prasankhyātāḥ purāṇa-jñaiḥ śrutarṣibhiḥ.

Here also *Bhaviṣye* can only mean 'in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa'; and that this was the meaning is testified to by two MSS of the Matsya which read the second half line, *purāṇe śruti-sarṣibhiḥ*³. These passages therefore prove that the versions of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa were borrowed from the Bhaviṣya or were at least based on it; and the accounts in the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata must also have been derived therefrom, because they were later redactions as shown above.

9. The Bhaviṣya therefore as the source of all these accounts should be invaluable in elucidating them; but the copies of it, which I have seen or obtained information about, either do not contain this matter or present it in a wholly corrupted form. It is therefore, as it exists now, of no value for the present purpose and has been left out of consideration. An explanation, how it came to be tampered with, will be offered in connexion with the age of these versions (§ 28).

Prophetic Form of the Account.

10. All these accounts profess to be prophetic, yet the standpoints from which these Purāṇas view these genealogies differ somewhat. The Viṣṇu professes to have been narrated by Parāśara to Maitreya, and sets out the Paurava genealogy from the standpoint of the reign of Abhimanyu's son Parikṣit, and the Aikṣvāku and Bārhadratha genealogies from the time of the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas⁴. This is absurd, because Parāśara was Vyāsa's father and was dead long before that battle and Parikṣit's birth. All the other Purāṇas profess to have been recited by the Sūta to the ṛishis in Naimiṣa forest and (except in the Garuḍa) at their twelve-year sacrifice⁵. The Vāyu fixes the time of that sacrifice as the

¹ Not cited in the Preface (see p. 1).

² See also p. 3, note ⁴⁵.

³ See p. 59, l. 10, and note thereto.

⁴ CVṣ iv, 20, 12-13, and 21, 1: also 22,

1 and 23, 1.

4Mt 1, 4; AVā 1, 13-15; Bḍ i, 1, 17, 18, 35, 36; GBh i, 1, 4-6; CGr 1, 3-11.

They differ in the Sūta's name.

reign of the Paurava king Asīmakṛṣṇa¹, who is more often called Adhisīmakṛṣṇa², and who was fourth in descent from Parīkṣit; and the Matsya and Vāyu say the same in nearly the same words when mentioning that king in this account of the Kali age³. These two Purāṇas thus deal with these genealogies from the standpoint of his reign, and the Brahmāṇḍa, Bhāgavata, and Garuḍa constructively profess to do the same.

11. The Matsya and Vāyu carry out that view. They bring the Paurava genealogy from Abhimanyu and his son Parīkṣit down to Adhisīmakṛṣṇa as already past, and name Adhisīmakṛṣṇa as the reigning king⁴; the rishis then inquire about the Kali age, and the Sūta, declaring his intention to set out all the future kings, begins the list of future Pauravas from that monarch. Similarly, in the contemporary Aikṣvāku and Bārhadhratha genealogies, these two Purāṇas name Divākara as reigning then in Ayodhyā and Senājit in Magadha⁵, and mention their predecessors as past and their successors as future. Hence they virtually declare that these three kings were contemporary⁶. The position taken in the Brahmāṇḍa is the same, though it is obscured by a large lacuna in which all the Paurava and Aikṣvāku kings are lost, and its account begins with line 23 on page 12. Thenceforward it agrees with the Matsya and Vāyu and mentions Senājit as the reigning Bārhadhratha king. The Bhāgavata and Garuḍa, though professing to have been recited in Adhisīmakṛṣṇa's reign, take the former the standpoint of Parīkṣit's reign⁷, and the latter that of his son Janamejaya⁸; and both treat all the successors and also all the Aikṣvāku and Bārhadhratha kings after the great battle as future. The Viṣṇu agrees with the Bhāgavata in this attitude, as already mentioned.

12. Accordingly the texts are framed for the most part in prophetic shape, but this character is not maintained completely because past expressions occur here and there, such as *abharat*⁹, *smṛta*¹⁰, &c. Some MSS have tried to be more consistent by modifying such words¹¹. One line found in three MSS frankly states that the whole Aikṣvāku dynasty was ancient, and naturally does not appear in any of the other MSS¹². There can be no doubt therefore that the accounts have been steadily though slowly revised in details, so as to improve their prophetic character.

¹ In its verse, 1, 12—

Asimakṛṣṇe vikrānte rājany an-upama-
tviṣi
praśāsati mān dharmena bhūmim bhūmipa-
sattame.

² See p. 4, note 10.

³ AMt 50, 66, 67; AVā 99, 258, 259.

⁴ See p. 4, l. 6.

⁵ See p. 10, l. 5, and p. 15, l. 13.

⁶ In equating these kings some 20 years must be prefixed to the Paurava list on account of Yudhiṣṭhira's reign after the

great battle, before Parīkṣit came to the throne, see § 14.

⁷ GBh ix, 1, 6.

⁸ CGr 140, 40.

⁹ E.g. p. 10, note 23; p. 11, l. 18.

¹⁰ E.g. p. 5, l. 11; p. 11, ll. 14, 21.

¹¹ E.g. *bharat* for *abharat*, p. 10, note 23; p. 11, note 51.

¹² P. 12, l. 26. It is no doubt genuine, for no one would be likely to fabricate and interpolate it to mar the prophecy.

13. Though the account is said to have been narrated to Paurava kings or to rishis in Naimiṣa forest, yet the ground from which the historic changes are viewed is Magadha. The Paurava and Aikṣvāku dynasties are dealt with briefly, with two kings generally to a line and with no mention of the lengths of the reigns, but the Bārhadratha dynasty of Magadha is set out with one line to each king and the length of his reign is stated¹. After those three ancient kingdoms disappeared, the dynasties treated of are those which reigned in or dominated Magadha. All other dynasties in North India are noticed only in the aggregate, with the exception of the dynasty of Vidiśā, and even that is described but cursorily (p. 49).

14. The beginning of the Kali age has been discussed by Dr. Fleet, and he has pointed out that it began on the day on which Kṛṣṇa died, which the chronology of the Mahābhārata places, as he shows, some twenty years after the great battle, and that it was then that Yudhiṣṭhira abdicated and Parīkṣit began to reign². But, as shown above, these Purāṇas virtually begin the Kali age dynasties immediately after the battle, and that position is the most convenient to adopt for the present purpose. The text of the Matsya and Vāyu³ can be brought into harmony therewith by merely altering the order of a few verses without tampering with them, namely, by transposing the four verses containing the rishis' questions and the prefatory verses of the Sūta's reply from their position in Adhiśimākṛṣṇa's reign to the commencement of the account; and, so treated, those verses form a fitting preface to the whole: but it is unnecessary to print the questions here, and those prefatory verses are alone introduced as a sufficient preface (see p. 1).

Original Language of the Account.

15. There are clear indications that the Sanskrit account as it exists in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa was originally in Prakrit, or, more accurately, that it is a Sanskritized version of older Prakrit ślokas. The indications are these: *first*, certain passages as they stand now in Sanskrit violate the śloka metre, whereas in Prakrit form they would comply with the metre; *secondly*, certain Prakrit words actually occur, especially where they are required by the metre, which the corresponding Sanskrit forms would violate; *thirdly*, Sanskrit words occur at times in defiance of syntax, whereas the corresponding Prakrit forms would make the construction correct; *fourthly*, mistaken Sanskritizations of names; *fifthly*, the copious use of expletive particles; and *sixthly*, irregular sandhi.

16. A full examination of these peculiarities would overload this Introduction, and the proof of them has therefore been set out in Appendix I. The above conclusion holds good for the whole of the text of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa;

¹ The *Early Contemporary Dynasties* summarize all except the Māgadhas (p. 23).

² JRAS, 1911, pp. 479, 675, 686; and p. 62, l. 37 *infra*. Hence in equating the Paurava kings with the Aikṣvāku and Bār-

badratha kings, some 20 years must be prefixed to the former.

³ This portion in the Brahmāṇḍa is lost in the lacuna, as already mentioned.

their verses are older Prakrit ślokas Sanskritized. It also holds good for such portions of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata as have preserved the old verses; but the main portions of these two Purāṇas are condensed redactions composed directly in Sanskrit. The Garuḍa version is a more concise condensation composed directly in Sanskrit apparently. These conclusions are explained in Appendix I.

17. Judging from such specimens of old ślokas and Prakritisms as have survived, it would appear that the Prakrit used in the original ślokas was a literary language not far removed from Sanskrit¹. The art of writing was introduced into India some seven centuries B.C., and there can be no doubt that it must have been adopted early in the Courts because of its manifest administrative usefulness. Records must have been kept by secretaries and chroniclers in the royal offices, and as those men would not always have been Sanskrit scholars, the language they used would presumably have been as elegant a Prakrit as their courtly surroundings and predilections required. There must have been ample written material concerning the dynasties from the 7th century B.C. from which metrical chronicles could have been composed by bards, minstrels, and reciters² in the same kind of language, to entertain not only their royal and noble patrons but also all those who found an interest in hearing of former times³. As Magadha was a great, if not the chief, centre of political activity during those ages, we can perceive how it was that the account grew up with Magadha as its centre (§ 13). The Māgadhas were celebrated as minstrels, and since traditions are most easily remembered, are best handed down, and confer the greatest pleasure, when cast into poetical form, it is easy to understand how this metrical account of the dynasties in literary Prakrit could have developed among them. Hence we may infer that the original ślokas were composed in Māgadhi: or, since the account, much as we have it now, was compiled and edited apparently in North India⁴, and one verse that the Bhāgavata has preserved is in Pali⁵, they may have been in Pali, either originally or perhaps more probably by conversion.

¹ Pali is such a language, and other specimens are found in the early inscriptions.

Sūtas, māgadhas, and vandinis; and other professional singers.

² Such men have existed in India from early times, and a graphic account of them, their methods, popularity, and influence, will be found in Babu Dinesh Chandra Sen's excellent 'History of Bengali Language and Literature', pp. 162-7, 584-5, 588-90. Since the brahmins could and did transmit the Vedic hymns with verbal accuracy for many hundreds of years, there is no improbability in supposing that bards and minstrels could hand down metrical accounts of dynasties with substantial though not

with verbal accuracy. As these bards and minstrels existed in all parts of North India, they were a check on one another in the transmission of tradition, and there are indications that the Purāṇic traditions of the dynastic genealogies were compiled with some attempt to ascertain the truth. Moreover there was no objection to the accounts being written down, as soon as writing came into general use; and that would have been also a check on variation.

⁴ See § 27.

⁵ See Appendix I, § ii. Certain other words mentioned in Appendix I appear to be Pali.

Age of the Compilation of the Account.

18. The account supplies two kinds of internal evidence to fix the time when it was compiled, namely, *first*, the subject matter, and *secondly*, textual peculiarities; and both are important. The latter are dealt with in § 26, and the former is discussed first. The subject matter consists of two parts, the earlier setting out the dynastic details, and the later part describing the unhappy conditions that should prevail and stating certain chronological and astronomical particulars¹. These are treated here separately.

19. The dynastic portion shows two stages of termination. The earlier of these stages is the period following the downfall of the Andhras and the local kingdoms that survived them a while. The Matsya account ends here with the mere mention of the Kilakila kings², and no MS of the Matsya contains anything later. The Andhra kingdom fell about A.D. 236, and it may be said that the Matsya account brings the historical narrative down to about the middle of the third century A.D. and no further.

20. The Vāyu, Brahmāṇḍa, Viṣṇu, and Bhāgavata all carry the narrative on to the rise of the Guptas, which is the later stage. The Guptas are mentioned as reigning over the country comprised within Prayāga, Sāketa (Ayodhya), and Magadha, that is, exactly the territory which was possessed at his death by Candragupta I who founded the Gupta dynasty in A.D. 319-20 and reigned till 326 or 330 (or even till 335 perhaps), before it was extended by the conquests of his son and successor Samudragupta. With the Guptas are mentioned Nāgas, Maṇidhānyas, and others as reigning contemporaneously over the countries which surrounded the Gupta territory³ and which were subjugated afterwards by Samudragupta⁴. The account takes no notice of his conquests nor of the Gupta empire. These particulars show clearly that this account was closed during the interval which elapsed between the time when Candragupta I established his kingdom from Magadha over Tirhut, Bihar, and Oudh as far as Allahabad⁵, and the beginning of Samudragupta's reign, for he began his conquests immediately after his accession. That interval is approximately A.D. 320-330 or perhaps 335. It is hardly credible that, if this account was compiled later, it would have omitted to notice Samudragupta's conquests, or would have mentioned the foregoing kingdoms (which he subdued) in the same terms as his kingdom. The Gupta era was established in A.D. 320, and it may be concluded that this account was closed soon after the commencement of that era, or, if we allow some margin for delay, by the year A.D. 335.

21. Hence it appears that the versified chronicles were first collected about or

¹ The earlier part pp. 1-55, and the later pp. 55 ff.

² That is l. 15 on p. 48. The Vṣ says they were Yavanas, see note ⁸² thereto.

³ See pp. 53-5.

⁴ V. Smith's *History*, 2nd edn. pp. 267-9; and JRAS, 1909, p. 342.

⁵ V. Smith's *History*, p. 266.

soon after the middle of the 3rd century¹ in the shape found in the *Matsya*, and that they were extended to the rise of the Gupta kingdom before the year 335, which augmented compilation is what the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* contain and the *Viṣṇu* and *Bhāgavata* have condensed. It has been shown that the *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa* all obtained their accounts from the *Bhaviṣya*. Hence it would appear that the earlier compilation must have been incorporated in the *Bhaviṣya* about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century, and that its prophetic account was extended in the later compilation before the year 335. There is nothing improbable in this augmentation, because the *Bhaviṣya* account has been continually supplemented even up to the present time in order to keep its prophecies up to date, as shown above (§ 6). It follows then that the *Bhaviṣya* must have been in existence in the middle of the 3rd century²; and it would appear that the *Matsya* borrowed what the *Bhaviṣya* contained before the Gupta era, and that the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* borrowed the *Bhaviṣya*'s augmented account about or soon after the year 330 or 335. Further remarks on these dates are offered in §§ 43 ff.

22. Further light is thrown on these points by the MS *eVāyu*, which contains the full account but holds a position intermediate between the general *Vāyu* version and the *Matsya* version. The facts to be explained are these. The *Matsya* has one version which contains only the shorter compilation, the *Vāyu* generally has a somewhat different version containing the full account, the *Brahmāṇḍa* has the full compilation in a version resembling the *Vāyu* closely, *eVāyu* has a version containing the full compilation in a text intermediate between the *Matsya* and all other copies of the *Vāyu*³, and yet all these *Purāṇas* declare they borrowed their accounts from the *Bhaviṣya*.

23. The only theory which appears to me to explain all these facts is this. The *Matsya* borrowed from the *Bhaviṣya* the shorter account about (say) the last quarter of the 3rd century. The *Bhaviṣya* account was then extended down to the time when the Gupta kingdom had acquired the territories assigned to it, and its language was revised⁴; that would be (say) about 320-325. The *Vāyu* copied that extended and revised account from the *Bhaviṣya* almost immediately, and that is the version found in *eVāyu*. Afterwards, the language of the *Bhaviṣya* version was revised again, and this must have been done very soon, (say) about 330-335, before the Gupta kingdom had developed into the Gupta empire by Samudragupta's conquests, because it could hardly have failed to notice that immense change if the revision had been later. This second revision was soon adopted by the *Vāyu* and is the version found now in *Vāyu* MSS generally. The fact that

¹ There is an apparent indication that a compilation was begun in the latter part of the 2nd century in the Andhra king *Yajñaśrī*'s reign, for 5 MSS of the *Matsya* (of which three appear to be independent, namely, *b*, *c*, and *d*) speak of him as reigning in his ninth or tenth year; see p. 42, note ^a.

If so, the *Bhaviṣya* may perhaps have existed in that century.

² But not of course in its present condition.

³ The position of *eVā* is best shown in the account of the Mauryas, pp. 27-9.

⁴ This, as already pointed out, is what has been habitually done to it.

eVāyu stands unique among all the *Vāyu* MSS suggests that no long interval could have separated the second revision from the first, and that the first revised version was quickly superseded by the second in the *Vāyu*. I cannot speak about the *Brahmāṇḍa* in any detail, because I have not been able to collate any MSS of it: yet two points may be noticed, *first*, it agrees closely with the general *Vāyu* version¹ and yet condenses the account sometimes²; and *secondly*, the probability is that it borrowed the second revised version from the *Bhaviṣya* not long after the *Vāyu* adopted that³. The *Bhaviṣya* existed in writing when the first revision appeared in it, because *eVāyu*, as well as all other *Vāyu* MSS, uses the word *paṭhila* when acknowledging its indebtedness to the *Bhaviṣya* (see § 7). The *Matsya* uses the word *kathila* in the corresponding passage, which might imply that it borrowed the account orally at the earlier stage, but that is not probable because of the inferences brought out in Appendix II.

24. If this explanation be tenable, the *Matsya* version of these dynasties of the Kali age is older than those of the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa*⁴, and *eVāyu* gives us the earliest text of the *Vāyu*. The styles of the versions appear to support this explanation, for the *Matsya* version is somewhat crude at times, and the *Vāyu* text has been revised more than the *Matsya* as shown by the story of king Janamejaya's dispute with the brahmins⁵. Though later than the *Matsya*, the *Vāyu* account may yet be more accurate at times by reason of the revision which it underwent⁶. The *Vāyu* has Prakritisms sometimes where the *Matsya* has correct Sanskrit⁷, but this fact is not incompatible with that conclusion, and for either or both of two reasons; (1) the *Matsya* may have emended such defects at the time of taking the account from the *Bhaviṣya*, while the *Vāyu* may have copied them as they stood; and (2) a process of silent emendation has been in continual operation in the MSS⁸. Further it would seem that the three accounts may have been compared at times, for this would explain certain small variations which appear occasionally between the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* in the direction of the *Matsya*⁹.

¹ The agreement is not only here, but large portions also of the *Brahmāṇḍa* are almost identical with the *Vāyu*.

² As in p. 22, note ⁴⁶; p. 35, note ⁴². In those passages the *Bhāgavata* partially resembles it, and may have copied from it.

³ Unless (what is possible) the *Brahmāṇḍa* copied its account from the *Vāyu* (see note ¹); and its paraphrase of *Aśoka-vardhana* as *aśokānām ca trṛpti-dah*, if not a late attempted emendation of a text that was unintelligible, suggests that it could not have been composed until *Aśoka* was wholly forgotten.

⁴ I differ therefore from Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, who estimated (without giving reasons) the *Vāyu* account to be older than the *Matsya*; but agree with him that the *Viṣṇu*

is later and the *Bhāgavata* the latest: *Early History of the Dehkan*, 1895, p. 162. In all this discussion I am dealing only with the time when these accounts of the dynasties of the Kali age were incorporated in these *Purāṇas*, and not with the age of these *Purāṇas* themselves such as they were in that early period; see § 28, note.

⁵ See Appendix III.

⁶ As in the arrangement of verses (see pp. 27, 44), and in many of the readings in the concluding portion (pp. 55 ff).

⁷ See Appendix I, § iii, first instance.

⁸ *E.g.* p. 18, note ⁷; see Appendix I, § ii.

⁹ These conclusions do not imply that these *Purāṇas* existed then in their present

25. The second portion of the account referred to in § 18 consists of (1) an exposition of the evils of the Kali age, and (2) a chronological-astronomical summary of the age, and is found in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa. This second portion therefore existed in the earliest version compiled soon after the middle of the 3rd century, yet with a difference. While the Matsya has a good deal of the exposition, the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa version contains some 32 more lines and is nearly twice as long as the Matsya; so that a large addition was made at the revision, and it was made mostly at the first revision, because the account in eVāyu has the full description with the exception of a few verses which may have been omitted by oversight. As regards the chronological-astronomical summary however, all three Purāṇas practically agree, the Matsya wanting only two lines. These particulars therefore were complete in the first compilation and were not added to in the revisions; and this conclusion is corroborated by the fact that this summary in all three Purāṇas brings the reckoning down definitely only to the end of the Andhras, and uses the vague term *Andhr-ānt-ādyaś* in referring to future kings¹. No addition was therefore made to it at the revisions to bring it down to the Gupta era. It belongs then to the middle of the 3rd century and must be interpreted accordingly; and it shows that the *Saptarsi* cycle of 2700 years was known and was in use in India at that time, that is, about three centuries earlier than has been supposed². The treatment of these two subjects, the evils of the Kali age and the chronological-astronomical particulars, affords an excellent illustration of what the revisers did and did not do. They had no knowledge with which to augment or alter those particulars and so left them unmodified; but the deterioration of the Kali age was a subject congenial to pessimistic brahmanic views and they freely availed themselves of the opportunity of dilating upon it.

26. I come now to the subject of textual peculiarities mentioned in § 18. Further information may be discovered by examining the divergent readings of the same passage and especially the corruptions in names. A study of the variations shows that ordinarily the copyists copied what they found in dull good faith to the best of their ability, often writing the same name differently in contiguous lines³. Moreover these dynasties of śūdras and foreigners offered little inducement to readers to alter the texts. Hence the variations that crept in were mostly due to clerical blunders or to misreadings of the MSS copied; and the mistake might be detected and corrected, or might not. If not detected, the erroneous letter remained; if detected, the correct letter was written or inserted, and the incorrect letter was sometimes cancelled but was not seldom left uncanceled. In that state

shape. They have no doubt been freely added to since, see § 28, note.

¹ P. 58, ll. 9, 12, and p. 61, l. 23.

² See Encycl. Brit., 'Hindu Chronology'.

³ Cf. the corruptions in the well-known names, *Kauśāmbī* (p. 5, note¹⁰) and *Kāṇvāyana* (p. 34, note¹¹). Yet sometimes errors

were caused by a droll perversity or would-be cleverness, cf. p. 41, note⁸⁰; p. 42, note¹; and p. 47, note⁷¹: and sometimes where the text had become corrupt, it was boldly paraphrased afresh, cf. p. 26, note⁴²; p. 33, note⁸²; but the latter was probably the effort of a reader and not of a copyist.

the passage was repeated in subsequent copies, and misreadings are important chronologically if we can explain how they arose. If their divergent readings of the same name or passage be written in the ancient scripts, and resemble one another so closely in a particular script that an ordinary copyist might easily misread one for another, it may be inferred that the variation must have arisen out of a MS written in that script, and therefore that the text once existed in that script, that is, it had been written during the time when that script was in use. In this way it may be ascertained which are ancient and which are mediaeval or even modern corruptions. Most of the variations have arisen from misreadings of the Gupta and later scripts¹, but for the present purpose it is unnecessary to consider any that arose from misreading scripts that came into use after A.D. 330, the date when this account was finally compiled, and it is only essential to see whether any variations point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī or of Brāhmī.

27. It would overload this Introduction to examine such particulars here, and in Appendix II are noticed such cases as appear to throw light on this subject. It is shown there that errors are found in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Viṣṇu which point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī as their source. Hence it seems there is reasonable ground for inferring that this account of the dynasties was, in its earliest form, written in Sanskrit in Kharoṣṭhī, and, since Kharoṣṭhī was current only in Upper India, that the account was probably put together there: that is, since the earliest account was in the Bhaviṣya, that the Bhaviṣya account was written originally in Kharoṣṭhī and was put together in Upper India. If these conclusions are sound, it would follow that the account could not have been compiled later than about A.D. 330, because Kharoṣṭhī went out of use about that time. Further, judging from the point of view displayed in the portion which was added to the Bhaviṣya to bring it up to date about the year 320², it would seem that the composers of this portion were probably in Madhyadeśa, and more particularly perhaps in the country between Magadha and Mathurā. The Viṣṇu account was probably based on the same original for three reasons: (1) its dynastic matter agrees closely with that in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, and also the ślokas where it has preserved them; (2) it closes its account where they close theirs; and (3) it is not probable that its account was a new and independent compilation from early chronicles when the compilations in the Bhaviṣya, Matsya, and Vāyu were available. At the same time it was composed early enough for its account to be drawn from Kharoṣṭhī MSS. It seems probable then that the main part of the Viṣṇu which is in prose was composed from those Purāṇas directly in Sanskrit not very long after the Gupta era, (say) perhaps before the end of the 4th century. The Bhāgavata was, as shown in Appendix II, composed afresh in Sanskrit, except in so far as it has incorporated old ślokas; and must have been based on the same materials for the same three reasons mentioned above, yet most probably on the Viṣṇu chiefly, to which it has

¹ Many such may be detected in the notes, *n. r* and *v, c* and *v, &c.* such as mistakes of *p* and *l*, *y, n* and *r, l* and | ² See §§ 19-21.

the closest resemblances¹; and it was probably not composed till the 8th century or even later. These conclusions strictly refer only to these dynastic accounts.

Sanskritization of the Account.

28. It has been shown that the account was first compiled for the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa about the middle of the 3rd century A.D., and there are reasons why that was appropriate. Since royal genealogies constituted one of the subjects which every Purāṇa should treat of, the Bhaviṣya, as a work professing to deal with the future, could hardly ignore the dynasties that reigned after his time; and the dynasties of the Kali age would hold the same position in it that the ancient genealogies held in the Purāṇas which dealt with ancient stories². The account of

¹ See p. 18, note⁷; p. 25, notes^{6, 16, 22}; p. 28, note³⁰; and in its description of the evils of the Kali age, where the Viṣṇu and it have matter peculiar to themselves. It has resemblances to the Brahmāṇḍa in p. 22, note⁴⁶; p. 35, note⁴²; p. 41, note⁸⁰.

² The title Purāṇa indicates that such works narrated ancient stories, but the Bhaviṣya professed by its name to treat of the future, and the title Bhaviṣya Purāṇa is a contradiction in terms. Such a name could hardly have been possible, until the title Purāṇa had become so thoroughly specialized as to have lost its old meaning and become the designation of the kind of works now known by this title. The name Bhaviṣya Purāṇa therefore proves that the kind of composition that passed under the title Purāṇa had become stereotyped before the title could have been assumed by the Bhaviṣya; that is, that genuine Purāṇas must have preceded it so long before as to have specialized the title Purāṇa. It has been shown above that the Bhaviṣya existed in the middle of the 3rd century, hence some at least, if not many, of the true Purāṇas must be considerably older. This inference does not, of course, mean that the Purāṇas contained at their beginning all that they contain now, because there can be no doubt that they have been freely added to since. It is highly probable that they consisted at first mainly of ancient stories, genealogies, ballads, &c., which formed the popular side of ancient literature, and were quite probably in Prakrit originally. In fact, it seems to me that they were largely

in an old literary Prakrit used by the higher classes, but that, as the spoken languages diverged in time more and more from Sanskrit through political vicissitudes, that literary Prakrit became unintelligible, while Sanskrit remained the only polished language of brahmanic Hinduism. Hence it was natural that this literature should be Sanskritized, if it was to be preserved, a process that was not difficult because the old literary Prakrit was not far removed from Sanskrit, yet it was not always effected completely, especially in poetry where the necessity of preserving the metre sometimes qualified that process, and hence Prakrit forms might survive embedded in good Sanskrit as *pravarṭayitrā* in p. 88, l. 14. It was the brahmins probably who saved and improved the status of those old compositions by converting them into Sanskrit, and afterwards, perceiving what an excellent means they provided for reaching popular thought, made use of them to propagate their own views and doctrines by freely augmenting them with brahmanical fables, philosophical discussions, and ceremonial expositions which were enforced with the authority of Vyāsa. I should say therefore, speaking generally, that what may be called the kṣatriya, or better perhaps the popular, matter of the Purāṇas constituted the really old and genuine *purāṇa*, and that the brahmanical and ritual matters now found in them were later additions and interpolations made from time to time. This inference is based on the fact that it is in the former portion of the Purāṇas that peculiarities occur such as are

these dynasties would then naturally have been required for the Bhaviṣya, and all that was necessary was to collect the Prakrit metrical chronicles and convert them into Sanskrit prophecies uttered by Vyāsa¹. That was done as shown in Appendix I, and then the Matsya first, and the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa afterwards, borrowed the account from the Bhaviṣya. The original Bhaviṣya account has been lost, but these three Purāṇas have preserved and reveal what its contents were; otherwise it would have been impossible to know what it contained at that time. A comparison of their accounts with the present condition of the Bhaviṣya shows to what bold lengths pious fraud has gone.

29. Since the chronicles existed in the form of ślokas in literary Prakrit, all that was necessary was (1) to convert the Prakrit words into Sanskrit, and (2) substitute futures for past tenses, while maintaining the śloka metre. The first process appears to have been made word by word as nearly as possible², and the Sanskritization was crude as the many Prakritisms noticed in Appendix I indicate, for they must have existed in the Bhaviṣya account, otherwise it is difficult to see how they could appear in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa. Indeed it would almost seem that the Bhaviṣya account may have been composed in a literary Prakrit rather than in true Sanskrit. Both processes of conversion would have upset the metre, since Prakrit words are sometimes a syllable longer or shorter than their Sanskrit equivalents, and future tenses are generally longer than past tenses; hence three correctives were adopted; (1) words were dropped which might be omitted without impairing the sense, such as 'reigned', 'years', &c.; (2) compensatory expletives were inserted; and (3) the sentence was occasionally recast³. Still the Sanskritization was imperfect and sometimes grammar or metre was sacrificed, and these blemishes have persisted, as pointed out in Appendix I, in spite of attempts to rectify them afterwards.

noticed in Appendix I. It seems highly probable too that it was largely through the Purāṇic literature, that brahmanism re-established itself over the people and secured the revival of Hinduism and the downfall of Buddhism. That was what actually happened in Bengal and has been called by Babu Dinesh Chandra Sen the 'Paurāṇik Renaissance', which he has described very clearly in his excellent work 'The History of Bengali Language and Literature' (ch. iv).

¹ This was, as has been pointed out above, the beginning of a pious fraud, whereby the prophetic matter has been continually revised and brought up to date in the Bhaviṣya. To be able to point to such prophetic accounts in the literature would have been

a valuable weapon, moreover, in the hands of the brahmins against adversaries of other creeds; and it may be noted in this connexion, that the Venkateśvara edition of the Bhaviṣya has incorporated a summary of the Biblical account from Adam to Abraham in the early chapters of Genesis (Bhav. iii, 4, 17-19, 29-60; 5, 1-20). There can hardly be any doubt that this interpolation has been made very recently in view of Christianity.

² See the phrase *aṣṭāvinśati tathā varṣā* in Appendix I, § i.

³ Cf. for instance the lines in the *Andhras* where the two versions are given, and the notes thereto.

Errors, omissions, and rare verses.

30. Though there was originally one text common (but qualified by the revisions suggested in § 23) to the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa down to the end of the Andhras, yet present MSS show many errors and omissions and some misplacements. Such defects easily occurred through the carelessness of copyists¹, damage to² or loss of³ leaves, or disarrangement of leaves⁴. The blemishes in the text appear to have been generally accidental. The brahmins who compiled the Sanskrit account could and did fabricate passages portraying the evils of the Kali age, but had neither inclination nor incentive to invent particular dynasties or kings of foreign or base origin. The chief changes that can be placed under the head of fabrications are various attempts by later readers to improve the text in details in which it appeared to be corrupt or inelegant⁵, or to remove inconsistencies⁶. Among the latter some alterations, though made apparently in good faith, involved tampering with the text, as in the Śiśunāga dynasty, where the Matsya, by mistakenly introducing the first two Kāṇvāyana kings, names twelve kings instead of ten as all the other authorities declare; so that some copies of the Matsya have boldly altered the total to twelve, while others more cautiously have made the passage indefinite⁷. Misreadings have also produced incorrect statements and there are many errors in names and numbers⁸; but of deliberate falsification I have found no instance except in the story of the dispute between Janamejaya and the brahmins⁹.

31. It is reasonably certain, then, that in the main these versions have suffered from nothing but carelessness and accident, and considering what little interest this account could have for educated readers, especially those brahmanically-minded, the text has been fairly well preserved. Much may have been lost altogether, for some passages have almost disappeared. One Purāṇa, or even one MS only, has preserved a passage or verse sometimes which is wanting in all the rest: thus *eVāyu*, alone of all the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa MSS,

* ¹ As for instance the mistaken introduction of the first two Kāṇvāyana kings among the Śiśunāgas in the Matsya (see p. 21 and note ²⁴).

² Damage probably explains the frequent loss of verses here and there in different MSS.

³ Hence no doubt the absence of all the first part in the Brahmāṇḍa (see pp. 1, 3, 8).

⁴ As for instance the displacement in *eVāyu* of the last half of the Early Contemporary Dynasties, all the Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, and Kāṇvāyanas and the first twelve lines of the Andhras after Viśvasphāṇi

(see pp. 23, 24, 27, 30, 33, 35, 50).

⁵ See p. 26, note ⁴²; p. 33, note ⁶²; p. 52, notes ⁸⁷, ⁹⁸, ⁴².

⁶ As in p. 29, note ³².

⁷ See p. 22, note ⁴³.

⁸ As where the Bh misread *trayodaśa* as *bhūyo daśa*, p. 46, note ²². As regards the readings *Tuśāra* and *Tukhāra* in pp. 45, 47, it may be noted that *ṣ* has often been pronounced *kh* for centuries in North India, and that the letter *ṣ* was used at times for *kh*; hence these two letters are often confused: cf. p. 6, notes ³², ⁴³; p. 19, note ²⁹; p. 41, note ⁵⁰; p. 51, note ²⁴; &c.

⁹ See Appendix III.

contains the verse about Śālīśūka, and his existence might be doubted if it depended on that alone, but it is testified to by the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata¹. Again in the Bhāgavata only one copy has preserved the verse about Suśarman². Such being the conditions, no verse should be discarded even if it is found in only one MS. Thus line 26 of the Aikṣvākus appears only in three MSS, and lines 12–14 of the Preface only in *eVāyu*; yet it is not credible that they were fabricated, and they might easily have been regarded as valueless in the other MSS, for the former contradicts the alleged prophetic standpoint, and the latter merely name sundry and some unknown dynasties. Such rare passages appear to be relics of genuine tradition; and it is possible that lines 30, 31 of the Bārhadrathas found only in *jMatsya*, and line 28 of the Andhras found only in *eVāyu*, may be genuine. Other peculiar verses will be found in the notes³.

Formation of this Text.

32. The Bhaviṣya account having been the common source of the *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa* versions, the various readings are often equivalent or not materially different, so that real divergencies are far fewer than the places where the readings vary. The text now offered has been prepared according to the printed editions and the MSS collated. The *Matsya* and *Vāyu* versions are of far greater value than the *Brahmāṇḍa*, because they have been printed at Calcutta and in the Ānandāśrama series from a number of MSS, and I have collated besides 13 MSS of the *Matsya* and 11 of the *Vāyu*; whereas of the *Brahmāṇḍa* only the Venkateśvara edition has been available⁴, and I have seen no MSS containing this account. Where variations occur I have endeavoured to choose the most weighty, it being remembered (1) that the *Matsya* gives us the oldest version, *eVāyu* the next, and all other copies of the *Vāyu* and the *Brahmāṇḍa* the third recension; and (2) that the *Matsya* is at times a somewhat crude Sanskritization of the old Prakrit ślokaś, and the later versions may be more accurate. Their general agreement must be understood, but variations and omissions are always noticed, so that where no notes are given, the copies all agree.

33. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata cannot elucidate that common version except in the occasional passages where they adhere to it; and there they have been used to frame the text. Otherwise they can only help towards determining the correct names of the kings and the duration of the dynasties, and are so utilized in the notes. The Bhāgavata is also useful in determining the order of the kings, because, while the single lines devoted to individual kings might be and have been displaced at times in the *Matsya*, *Vāyu*, and *Brahmāṇḍa*, its versified lists preclude the

¹ P. 29, l. 10. He is also mentioned in the *Gāryiśāṃhitā* according to Max Müller in 'India: what can it teach us?' (ed. 1883) p. 298; but the passage is spurious, see JRAS, 1912, pp. 792–3.

² See p. 34, note¹⁹.

As p. 40, l. 13; p. 42, note⁸.

⁴ See *List of Authorities, Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa*.

shifting of names in a verse, and the disarrangement of lines would produce manifest disarrangement of groups of kings. Besides the Calcutta edition of the Viṣṇu and the Gaṇpat edition of the Bhāgavata, I have collated 10 MSS of the former and 18 of the latter, and also the French edition of the Bhāgavata so far as its Sanskrit text goes.

34. The Garuḍa is of use only for the names of the kings in the three earliest dynasties, and I have been able to collate only the Calcutta edition and two MSS. The Venkateśvara edition of the Bhaviṣya is of no value as already explained.

35. As regards variations in words, these when small, such as errors in sandhi¹, or optional ways of writing², or obvious clerical mistakes³, or mere trivial differences⁴, are generally disregarded or corrected unless there is something noteworthy in them⁵, for many of the MSS are carelessly written and abound in such blemishes; yet the notes will show that I have erred probably rather on the side of inclusion than of exclusion. Various letters are often written so much alike in the MSS as to be easily confused, such as *b* and *v*, *p* and *y*, *c* and *v*, *n* and *l*, *n* and *r*, subscript *r* and *u*, and the MSS often contain superfluous letters written by mistake and not cancelled. These flaws, when obviously purely clerical, have been disregarded in some cases, but otherwise, and especially where these particulars may prove significant in the matter of Prakritisms and scripts, have been cited in the notes as they stand, the superfluous letters being enclosed in square brackets. *B* and *v* when not distinguished in the MSS have been generally transcribed as they should be correctly, unless the actual letter seemed worthy of notice. Since the account is only a Sanskritized version of Prakrit ślokas, Prakrit forms have been admitted into the text if they are supported by the best authority, as more truly representing the original words especially in numerals. Variations of readings and corruptions of names have been arranged in the order of modification, so as to elucidate as far as possible the process of the changes, and when so placed, readings that are corrupt often prove to be highly instructive as regards both language and script⁶.

36. Though I am not an advocate of the use of Roman characters in lieu of Devanāgarī, yet, as this work is intended for the use of all interested in Indian archaeology whether Sanskrit scholars or not, practical usefulness should be the chief consideration in this presentation of the Purāṇic accounts of the dynasties of the Kali age. Hence the Roman character has been used throughout, because it

¹ *E.g.*, in p. 60, note ⁶³ *dfIVā* have *śatāt śatam* actually.

² As where conjunct nasals are written for convenience as anusvāra, or where consonants conjoined with *r* are optionally doubled.

³ Thus the Calc. edition of the Vāyu has *Snecca* sometimes instead of *Mleccha* by an obvious printer's error: see p. 47, note ⁷⁶.

⁴ As the insertion or omission of final anusvāra or visarga through mere carelessness.

⁵ To have noticed such minutiae would have swollen the notes beyond all reason and usefulness.

⁶ *E.g.* p. 39, note ⁴⁵; p. 40, note ⁶⁹; p. 47, note ⁷²; p. 49, note ¹⁴.

offers several advantages over Devanāgarī, namely, (1) words can be separated which would be all run together when written properly in Devanāgarī; (2) compound words and words that have fused together by sandhi can be divided by hyphens and so displayed distinctly; and (3) by so treating words capitals can be introduced for names, and names can be exhibited unmistakably, even when initial vowels have been modified by sandhi. The system of transliteration is that adopted by the Royal Asiatic Society and most other Oriental Societies. Where vowels are blended by sandhi, the resultant vowel has been marked with a circumflex, except *ai* and *au* where a circumflex is inconvenient and hardly necessary. Changes in sandhi, which are required by the variant readings, are treated as necessarily consequential and are not mentioned. It has been necessary to introduce the double hyphen (used in transliterating inscriptions and MSS) in order to distinguish separate words that have become fused by sandhi¹, and I trust this sign may be pardoned here, especially as this Purāṇic account is not literature but only patch-work Sanskritization.

Interpretation of the Account.

37. In interpreting the account the fact must be borne in mind that it was written in Prakrit originally, and this will throw light on many points, especially the variations in names and the meaning of numbers. It will explain how corruptions in names have sometimes occurred², it will help to elucidate doubtful passages³, and will be the best guide in solving difficulties in readings which appear corrupt⁴. The best course in such cases is to convert the different readings into literary Prakrit, write the Prakrit forms in the various old scripts, compare them, and see whether one can divine what was probably the original Prakrit statement. These remarks apply especially to the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa versions.

38. There is often great variation in names. In some cases the correct form can be selected by reference to other books or to inscriptions, but where there is no such agreement I have not ventured to emend the Purāṇic forms from other sources, because it is my duty simply to edit the text and not to attempt to make it square with our present scanty knowledge of ancient Indian history—which is a separate matter. In such cases I have confined myself to estimating what form of the name is best attested by the MSS, and often the only feasible course is to adopt the most central form from which the other forms may be considered

¹ Chiefly where names have fused with other words by single or double sandhi, as *bhaviṣyōdayanas* (p. 7, l. 23; p. 82) and *bhavitāśoka* (p. 27, l. 2; p. 28, l. 4 in *eVā*); these are printed as *bhaviṣyōdayanas* and *bhavit=Āśoka* in order to bring out the name clearly. It could hardly be dispensed with in such cases of double sandhi as *Vaṇanāṣṭau*

and *bhāryānyāḥ* (see p. 82); and as no line could well be drawn regarding its use, the simplest course was to adopt it throughout, except in the Appendixes and Introduction.

² *E.g.* p. 40, note ⁶⁹; p. 41, note ⁷⁴.

³ *E.g.* p. 52, notes ³⁷, ³⁸, ⁴².

⁴ P. 59, line 11 is an excellent crux for such solution.

to diverge¹; but this is a measure more of convenience than of accuracy, because it happens sometimes that the correct form is what would appear to be an aberrant form²; and in such cases what is, or would seem to be, the correct form is suggested sometimes in the notes³.

39. The numbers present much difficulty. Those that occur oftenest are *vinśati* and *triṃśati*, and their abbreviated forms *vinśat* and *triṃśat*, *vinśa* and *triṃśa*⁴; and the difficulty arises because *tr* and *r*, if written carelessly or if partially frayed, are hardly distinguishable in the later script⁵, and *l* and *r* in the Prakrit forms of these words might have been confused from the first in Kharoṣṭhī. Hence in many cases either may be read as other data may indicate, irrespective of the weight of the MSS.

40. Various groups of misreadings will appear on an examination of the notes, and the most important may be mentioned here. First, *abda*, if the loop of the *b* be carelessly written so as to touch the top bar (as I have found it sometimes), may easily be misread as *aṣṭa*, and there can be no doubt that *abda* and *aṣṭa* have often been confused. Thus, where most MSS read *aṣṭapañcāśatām cābdān*⁶, one has *cābdā*, two *cāṣṭān*, and one *cāṣṭū*; and here *aṣṭa* is plainly a corruption of *abda* because it is impossible after *aṣṭapañcāśatām*. Again, one set of readings is *so smā daśa*, *so 'smāḍ daśa* and *tasmāḍ daśa*, and another set is *aṣṭām daśa*, *aṣṭādaśa* and *so 'ṣṭādaśa*⁷: the latter suggest the reading *abdhān daśa*, which (with the frequent use of anusvāra for nasals) would be often written *abdhām daśa* and might be misread as *aṣṭāmdaśa* and so pass to *aṣṭādaśa*: thus *abdhān daśa* would reconcile all the readings as regards the number and would seem to have been the original reading. The same confusion occurs in other places⁸. This liability of *abda* and *aṣṭa* to be confused may harmonize other passages where the numbers 10 and 18 are in conflict. Moreover, *abla*, if the initial *a* is elided by Sanskrit or Prakrit sandhi, becomes *bda*; and *bda* may be mistaken for *dva* (= *dvaṇ*)⁹; hence *drā* and *dvaṇ* become a third alternative, and this possibility may harmonize other passages¹⁰. Secondly, *samā* and *sapta* have been confused sometimes, for it is not always easy to distinguish *m* and *pt* where written carelessly in the more modern scripts, as I have found. Thus two readings occur *saptāśatīm* and *samāśatīm*¹¹, and either might be derived from the other¹².

¹ See p. 39, note ⁴⁵ for an instance.

² E.g. Vindusāra, whose name is given correctly only by the Viṣṇu (p. 28, notes ²³, ²⁴).

³ As in p. 6, note ²⁹; p. 42, note ⁹⁸.

⁴ In *nMt śaḍvinśati* looks like *śaḍgvinśati* generally, and *ṣaṭtriṃśati* like *śaḍtriṃśati*.

⁵ For a clear instance see p. 57, note ⁴.

⁶ P. 15, l. 17, and notes.

⁷ P. 39, l. 5, and notes.

⁸ See p. 19, note ⁴⁶; p. 30, note ⁴⁶; p. 43, note ³³; p. 47, note ⁷⁷; p. 60, notes ⁷⁰, ⁸⁶;

p. 61, note ¹; p. 62, note ³⁵. For the reverse cf. perhaps p. 29, note ³¹.

⁹ I have not seldom found *bd*, *db*, and *dbb* inverted in the MSS, and *b* is generally written as *v*. See p. 22, note ⁴³.

¹⁰ Cf. probably p. 40, l. 13.

¹¹ That is, *samāh uśitīm* by double, or Prakrit, sandhi: p. 47, note ⁵⁴.

¹² See also p. 29, note ⁴⁴; p. 31, note ¹³; p. 40, notes ⁵⁴, ⁵⁵.

41. Misreadings could easily affect other numerals. Thus, *catvāriṃśa-t* occurs at times where it may be erroneous¹, and in such cases it might easily be a mistaken Sanskritization of Prakrit *cattāri sa* (or perhaps *ca*), for *cattāri* is both nomin. and accus., and is of all three genders². Again *daśa* and *śata* are sometimes confused³, and, since *daśa* appears in Prakrit as *daśa* and *dasa*, and *śata* as *śada* and *sada*⁴, either word might easily be altered to the other, since metathesis occurs in the MSS⁵. Again the final *ti* of numerals, especially *saptati*, may be a misreading of *vi* which may in Prakrit represent 'vi'⁶ or *vai*⁷ (Pali *ve*), for *v* and *t* might easily be confused in Kharoṣṭhī, so that *saptati* should probably be *sapta vai* in some cases⁸. In short in dealing with all numerals, it must be remembered that they were Prakrit originally, and their Prakrit forms are of primary importance.

42. The combination of numerals is important. They are used in two ways, *first*, in correct Sanskrit compounds, such as *caturviṃśati*, 24; *aṣṭaviṃśac-chatam*, 138; *saptaviṃśac-chatam*, 137⁹; and *secondly*, strung together in separate words. The latter construction alone requires notice, because it often follows what seems to me to have been a Prakrit arrangement and, if so, should be interpreted according to Prakrit usage. Thus, in Prakrit 'hundred' preceded by 'three' means 'three hundred', but followed by 'three' means apparently 'hundred (and) three'. The Prakrit numerals were Sanskritized as they stood, and were then declined regularly, so that 'three' appears as *trīṇi*, and 'hundred' seems to appear similarly in the plural as *śatāni*. If this view be right, *trīṇi śatāni* mean 'three hundred', but *śatāni trīṇi* 'hundred and three'. This conclusion may be tested by some cases, for it is very important if it is right.

43. The most important passage for this purpose is the statement that 18 Śakas would reign *śatāni trīṇy aśtīm ca* years¹⁰. This expression is ordinarily read as correct Sanskrit to mean 380, but there are cogent grounds to show that these words cannot have that meaning. These Śakas are, in Dr. Fleet's opinion, Nahapāna and his successors, whose kingdom began with (or about) the Śaka era, A.D. 78; and if these words mean 380, the conclusion could be and has been drawn that this Purāṇic notice was written after they had reigned 380 years, that is, about the year A.D. 458¹¹. Now this conclusion involves this consequence, that the account brings the notice of the Śakas down to A.D. 458 and yet wholly ignores the great Gupta

¹ See p. 14, l. 10; p. 21, ll. 3, 6; p. 22, l. 13; &c.

² Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 439.

³ See p. 30, note⁴⁶; p. 33, note⁵⁰.

⁴ Pischel, *op. cit.*, §§ 442, 448.

⁵ See p. 7, note⁴⁸; p. 32, note⁸²; p. 39, note⁴⁶; p. 45, note¹¹; p. 49, note²⁶; also *nrpaḥ* and *punah* are confused through their Pkt forms *napa* and *pana*, see p. 11, note⁵¹, and p. 45, note⁴.

⁶ Pischel, *op. cit.*, § 143.

⁷ *Sapta vi* actually occurs for *sapta vai*,

p. 53, note⁴. Similarly in names a final *vi* has been treated as a particle and the name curtailed, cf. p. 40, note⁶⁹, p. 42, note⁶⁸, and p. 43, note²⁴.

⁸ *E.g.* p. 28, l. 7.

⁹ P. 19, l. 10; p. 28, l. 9; p. 30, l. 15.

¹⁰ *Various Local Dynasties*, p. 46, l. 9. The number of Śaka kings is given also as 10, or 16 (see p. 45, l. 3), which seem more probable.

¹¹ JRAS, 1912, p. 1047.

empire which was paramount in North India after A.D. 340 and was still flourishing in 458¹. This is incredible, because the Gupta kings were orthodox Hindus, guided by brahman advisers, and skilled in Sanskrit²; and this Purāṇic account, which was brahmanical, would unquestionably, if not closed till 458, have extolled their fame. The argument *ex silentio* is incontestable here. The fact then that the account knows nothing of events most congenial to brahmanism later than 330 shows that the rendering '380' leads to impossible results: indeed no date later than about A.D. 330 is possible. These words *śatāni trīṇi aśitīm ca* occur in the Matsya as well as in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, and the Matsya account is that which was compiled in the Bhaviṣya about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century A.D. If we read these words as '380' with reference to that time, they take us back to about 130 or 120 B.C. as the beginning of these Śakas—a result that no one will accept. From both these alternative interpretations therefore it appears that the rendering of these words as '380' stultifies them.

44. We may now try reading these words as 'hundred, three, and eighty', 183. Applying them to Nahapāna and his successors and reckoning from A.D. 78 as before, we obtain the year A.D. 260-1 as the date of this notice of the Śakas, and this agrees entirely with the conclusion, reached above on other grounds (§ 21) that the account was first compiled about or soon after the middle of the 3rd century. This rendering '183' therefore brings all the particulars into an agreement which is strong evidence that it is the true meaning; and it further gives something like a precise date for the first compilation of the account in the Bhaviṣya as preserved in the Matsya, namely, A.D. 260-1. This statement, that the Śakas had reigned 183 years in A.D. 260, does not imply that they had come to an end then, but simply that the account being compiled then could say nothing about the future. So far as the account is concerned, they might have reigned, and in fact did reign, long afterwards, for there are coin-dates for them down to the year '311'. Such coin dates refer to a time after the account was compiled, and are in no conflict with the rendering '183'. This date A.D. 260-1 is a lower limit, for, if the Śakas formed a kingdom before their era was established, the reckoning would start from before A.D. 78, and the 183 years would have expired some little time before A.D. 260.

45. This conclusion is corroborated by the notice of the Hūṇas or Maunas along with the Śakas. They are said to have reigned, eleven for *śatāni trīṇi* years³. It is not known when their rule began, so that exact calculations cannot be made for them; but, if these words be read as '300', difficulties occur precisely similar to those discussed with regard to the Śakas and show that that meaning cannot be right. Read as meaning '103' however the statement may be true; Hūṇas or Maunas may have formed some small kingdom for 103 years on the frontiers of

¹ V. Smith, *Early History of India*, 2nd ed., pp. 289-90. ³ P. 47, l. 14. Their number is also given less probably as 18 or 19 (cf. p. 46, l. 5).

² *Id.*, pp. 282, 287.

India in A. D. 260. The corresponding line relating to the Tuṣāras is certainly corrupt, and their period should probably be 105 or 107 years¹, which would be possible in A. D. 260.

46. All the statements regarding the 'Various Local Dynasties' in pp. 45-47 must be read with reference to the date of the first compilation which is preserved in the Matsya. When the account was revised and brought up to date in the Bhaviṣya at the Gupta era in the version found now in the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa, the periods assigned to the Śaka and other mleccha dynasties should have been revised for the further period of 60 or 70 years, but that was not done, for the periods are the same in the two versions. The brahmins, who revised the account at that time, merely revised the language and not the statements. That was natural, for revision of the statements required fresh and precise calculations, for which they may have had few data and certainly had little inclination, as the dynasties were mleccha or śūdra. All they did was to extend the account by adding the fresh matter contained in p. 48, l. 16 to p. 55, l. 17; yet in that they do appear to have included further particulars about the Śakas on p. 49, for there can be little doubt that Nahapāna's successors are alluded to in l. 4², though the context is vague.

47. This examination of the circumstances thus leads to the conclusion that the numerals discussed here cannot be read as correct Sanskrit, and that read in the way now suggested they accord with the circumstances and also apparently with Prakrit usage. Hence I would submit that they must be interpreted in that way. This construction simplifies numerical statements remarkably and reduces to reasonable and probable totals figures that seem at first wild and extravagant. At the same time one must hesitate to assert that numerical statements must always be so read, for it certainly seems that the period assigned to the Andhras by the Matsya is 460 rather than 164 years³.

Conclusion.

48. The foregoing results and inferences may be summarized thus. The Bhaviṣya was the first Purāṇa to give an account of the dynasties of the Kali age; and the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa got their accounts from it (§§ 7, 8), though

¹ P. 47, l. 11 with p. 45, l. 4. *Sahasrāṇi* is sometimes a corruption of *sa* (or *tu*) *varṣāṇi*, see p. 25, note¹⁸; p. 46, note²⁶.

² This would be natural, if they fostered brahmanism and Sanskrit learning during the 3rd century (V. Smith, *History*, p. 287); though they are treated so curtly in the earlier part, before they favoured Hinduism.

³ It says there were 19 Andhra kings, and I may offer a tentative suggestion. The Andhra who overthrew the Kānvāyanas

was not Simuka as these Purāṇic accounts say, but probably one of the kings, nos. 12-14 (V. Smith, *History*, p. 194). Possibly then the Matsya account may refer only to him and his successors, and they may have been 19: but the period if read as 164 years would be too short for them. Otherwise its reading *ekonaviṃśatir* should probably be *ekonaviṃśatir*, which is quite possible, see § 39.

they no doubt, and many of the Purāṇas certainly, existed before the Bhaviṣya (§ 28, note). Metrical accounts of the dynasties, that reigned in North India after the great battle between the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas, grew up gradually, composed in ślokas in a literary Prakrit and recited by bards and minstrels (§§ 15–17); and, after writing was introduced into India about seven centuries B.C., there could have been no lack of materials from which those accounts could have been composed and even written down (§ 17). Such accounts were composed in or near Magadha more particularly, which was one of the chief centres of political life and thought during those times (§ 13) and was famous for its bards and minstrels (§ 17); and the Prakrit in which they were expressed was no doubt a literary Māgadhi or Pali (§ 17).

49. The Bhaviṣya professed to treat of future events, subsequent to that battle which practically ushered in the Kali age (§ 14), and should therefore supply an account of the dynasties of that age, because royal vainśas were one of the prescribed topics of the Purāṇas (§ 28); and, as the Purāṇas professed to have been composed by Vyāsa, it took the same standpoint. Hence it appropriated the Prakrit metrical accounts, converted the Prakrit ślokas into Sanskrit ślokas, and altered them to the form of a prophecy uttered by Vyāsa (§§ 28, 29, Appx 1); and this re-shaping was carried through generally yet not completely (§ 12). Some compilation seems to have been made, of the Andhras at least, in the reign of the Andhra king Yajñaśrī about the end of the second century A.D. (§ 21, note)¹; but the first definite compilation is that which brought the 'history' down from the time of the battle to a little later than the end of the Andhras², together with the final portion³, and was incorporated in the Bhaviṣya about or soon after the middle of the third century (§§ 19, 21, 24); and there are reasons for fixing its date as not later than A.D. 260–1 (§ 44). That account was apparently written in Kharoṣṭhī and composed in Northern India (§ 27). The Matsya borrowed it from the Bhaviṣya, probably during the last quarter of the third century (§ 23), and so has preserved what the Bhaviṣya contained then.

50. The Bhaviṣya account was revised about the years 315–320 and brought up to date by the insertion of the later dynastic matter⁴ and much addition to the 'Evils of the Kali Age'⁵: it was still in Kharoṣṭhī, and was certainly written down then (§§ 23, 27). That version was borrowed by the Vāyu then, but exists now only in one MS, *eVāyu* (§ 23). The language of the account in the Bhaviṣya was revised again about the years 325–330, and that version was adopted by the Vāyu, and soon afterwards by the Brahmāṇḍa⁶, and now constitutes their general versions (§ 23). They have thus preserved what the Bhaviṣya contained at that time.

¹ It is possible that the use of the present tense for the three ancient Paurava, Aikṣvāku and Bārhadratha kings (§ 11) may have something genuine in it.

² P. 1 to l. 15 on p. 48.

³ Pp. 55–63: see § 25.

⁴ P. 48, l. 16 to p. 55.

⁵ Pp. 55, 56.

⁶ But the Brahmāṇḍa may have copied from the Vāyu (§ 23, note).

51. The Viṣṇu next utilized the account, perhaps before the end of the fourth century, and condensed it all in Sanskrit prose except the concluding portion (§ 27). The Bhāgavata also drew its materials from the same sources, from the Brahmāṇḍa and more particularly the Viṣṇu ; it retained some of the old ślokaś, but in the main condensed the matter into new Sanskrit ślokaś ; and it probably belongs to the 8th or even 9th century (§ 27). The Garuḍa utilized the same materials for the three great early dynasties only, and has merely a bald list of the kings in new Sanskrit ślokaś ; but its date is uncertain (Appx I, II).

52. Since those times a quiet process of small emendations in details has been at work in these Purāṇas ; but the Bhaviṣya, the source of them all, has been unscrupulously tampered with in order to keep its prophecies up to date, and the text now presented in the Veṅkaṭeśvara edition shows all the ancient matter utterly corrupted, but the prophecies brought boldly down to the nineteenth century.

53. The sixty-three MSS of these Purāṇas that have been collated have yielded a great quantity of different readings, and no pains have been spared to state and arrange them correctly, so that I trust the notes will be found free from errors. The Index comprises all names and forms of names mentioned in the text, notes, translation, appendixes, and introduction, except such peculiar forms as are obviously erroneous or occur in single MSS of no particular trustworthiness.

54. In conclusion I have to tender my thanks to Dr. J. F. Fleet. He had long thought that a critical edition of the Purāṇa texts of these dynasties was greatly needed, and it was at his desire that I undertook this work, which has proved full of interest. He has done me the kindness to read most of this Introduction, and to offer me some criticisms and suggestions, which have been of great help and have also opened up some new questions that I have now endeavoured to elucidate ; and he has supplied the valuable references to various inscriptions which mention certain kings named in these dynastic lists.

F. E. PARGITER.

Oxford, *May* 15, 1913.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES

Editions and Manuscripts collated.

BHĀGAVATA PURĀṆA.

- BBh.* The edition published in part by Burnouf and continued afterwards. Skandha ix is in Skt, but sk xii only in translation. It differs very little from *GBh.*
- GBh.* The edition published by the Gaṇpat Kṛishṇāji Press, Bombay, 1889. Has a commentary, and some variant readings rarely.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- aBh.* Wilson 22; Auf. Cat. no. 86. Dated 1711. In Bengali characters; fairly well written; contains sk x-xii only.
- bBh.* Wilson 121-3; Auf. Cat. nos. 79-81. Dated 1813-6. Sk xii contains only the last portion, the Evils of the Kali Age, &c.
- cBh.* Mill 133-6; Auf. Cat. nos. 82-5. Dated 1823. Writing moderately good; many clerical errors.
- dBh.* Fraser 2; Auf. Cat. nos. 809-10. Does not contain sk ix; sk xii is dated 1407. Genly accurate. A very valuable MS; it contains alterations by another and apptly later hand, which are not always sound.
- eBh.* Walker 215-6; Auf. Cat. nos. 811-2. Dated 1794. Is close to *GBh* and fairly correct; writing poor.
- fBh.* Skt MS c. 54; W and K. Cat. no. 1180. Dated 1642. A very valuable MS in Śāradā script. Writing good and almost free from mistakes.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- gBh.* No. 3206, E 3461. Date about 1650. Fairly good.
- hBh.* Nos. 2759-60, E 3463-4. Dated 1762-3. Contains sk v-xii; writing poor but fairly correct, except for many small clerical errors.
- jBh.* No. 976, E 3466. Modern. Contains sk viii-xii; well written and fairly correct.
- kBh.* Nos. 654 and 656, E 3470 and 3472. Modern. Carelessly written.
- lBh.* Nos. 1838-9, E 3474-5. Modern. Well written, with few clerical errors; is close to *GBh.*
- mBh.* Nos. 2502 and 2506, E 3189 and 3493. Dated 1779-81. Fairly good.

- n*Bh. Nos. 2756-7, E 3495-6. Dated 1780-1. Fairly well written, with few clerical errors.
- p*Bh. Nos. 2437 and 2439, E 3503 and 3505. Date, 18th cent. Fairly good.
- q*Bh. Jones MS; W 3a, T 32. Date, beginning of 17th cent. Fairly good.
- r*Bh. Jones MS; W 3b, T 33. Date, end of 18th cent. In Bengali characters; fairly good.
- s*Bh. Jones MS; W 3c, T 34. Date, 18th cent. Written on palm leaves; fairly good: does not contain sk ix.
- t*Bh. Tagore MS; no. 106; Auf. list no. 14. Date, about 1780. In Bengali characters on palm leaves.

There are two other MSS in the Bodleian—one, Wilson 117; Auf. Cat. no. 87, which contains sk x and not xii as stated in the Cat., and so has nothing about these dynasties: the other, Mill 145; Auf. Cat. no. 88, written on an extremely long narrow roll. There are also two similar MSS in the British Museum, Add. 16624 and 26419. These three are mere bijou MSS, written in minute characters and decorated with coloured pictures and designs.

BHĀVIṢYA PURĀṆA.

Edition published by the Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay. The Pratisarga-parvan deals with the dynasties of the Kali age, but the account is not genuine, see Introdn. §§ 6, 9, 28, and ZDMG, lvii, 276.

I have examined the following MSS, but none of them contain anything about these dynasties:—

in the India Office Library, two, no. 1314, E 3447, and no. 1429, E 3448;

in the Bodleian Library, three, Auf. Cat. nos. 75 (Wilson 103), 76 (Wilson 126), and 77 (Wilson 124);

in the Royal Asiatic Society, MS Tod 2;

in the Nepal State Library, one MS sent to Oxford with other selected MSS.

I have also made inquiries about MSS elsewhere, but have not found any in which this dynastic matter can be deemed genuine. The Sanskrit College, Calcutta, has a MS, *g* no. 106, from which two extracts were sent me; it describes the founding of Calcutta. Queen's College, Benares, has a MS but it does not contain this dynastic matter, as Prof. Venis informs me. He sent me an extract from a MS belonging to the College Librarian, Paṇḍit Vindhyeśvarīprasād Dvivedī, but it deals with later events and especially with the Mohammedans.

BRAHMĀṆḌA PURĀṆA.

- Bḍ*. The edition published by the Śrī-Veṅkaṭeśvara Press, Bombay. It professes to be based on several MSS, yet gives variant readings only rarely, and leaves on my mind the impression that it has been silently emended at times; cf. p. 25, note ²⁴; p. 26, note ⁴²; p. 34, note ³; p. 51, note ¹⁰.

• I have also examined the following MSS, but they contain nothing about these dynasties :—

in the India Office Library, two, Burnell MS no. 458, and Tagore MS no. 10 (Auf. list, no. 11);

in the Bodleian Library, three, Auf. Cat. nos. 72 (Mill 51), 73 (Wilson 105), and 74 (Walker 130).

GARUḌA PURĀṆA.

OGr. The edition published by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, Calcutta, 1890. It contains no notes of variant readings.

MSS in the India Office Library.

aGr. No. 1199 c, E 3353. Dated 1727? Far from correct. Account begins, fol. 114^a, l. 1.

bGr. No. 2560, E 3355. Modern. Very incorrect. Account begins, fol. 103^a.

cGr. No. 1199 a, E 3354. Dated 1800. Badly written. Account begins, fol. 127^a, l. 2.

The Bodleian Library has one, Skt MS c. 50; but it contains nothing about these dynasties.

MATSYA PURĀṆA.

AMt. The Ānandāśrama (Poona) edition, 1907. It is based on 6 copies, the Veṅkaṭeśvara (Bombay) edition (marked **क** and cited here as *FMt*), the Gondhalekar (Poona) edition (marked **ख** and cited here as *GMt*), and 4 MSS marked **ग, घ, ङ, च** and cited here as *a*¹, *a*², *a*³, and *a*⁴ respectively.

CMt. The Calcutta edition by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, 1876.

GMt. The Gondhalekar edition; see *AMt*.

FMt. The Veṅkaṭeśvara edition; see *AMt*.

aMt. See *AMt*.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

bMt. Wilson 21; Auf. Cat. no. 95. Dated 1729. Well written, fairly free from clerical mistakes, but errs widely in names and has corrupt readings, especially near the end. Has marginal notes of different readings by one or two other hands; these form no part of the text and are not noticed here. Where it varies from the general *Mt* text, it often agrees with the *Vā* and *Bd*.

cMt. Fraser 1; Auf. Cat. nos. 813–4. Date, 17th cent. apptly. Fairly well written and genly correct. Where it varies from *AMt* it agrees often with *AVā*. Paurava kings, vol. i, fol. 113^a, verse 55; the rest, vol. ii, fol. 575^b, l. 1.

MSS in the India Office Library.

dMt. No. 1918, E 3548. Dated 1525. Good, but with not a few inaccuracies. Where it differs from *AMt*, it agrees often with *AVā*. Paurava kings, fol. 63^a, l. 8; other dynasties, fol. 307^a, l. 2.

- eMt.* No. 2032, E 3549. Dated 1767. Writing poor and full of clerical mistakes; agrees genly with *cMt* and sometimes corruptly. Paurava kings, fol. 67^b, l. 13; other dynasties, fol. 321^b, l. 8.
- fMt.* No. 1080, E 3550. Dated 1795. Fairly well written; many small clerical mistakes (as *s* for *ś* often) and a very few corrections. Paurava kings, fol. 62^a, l. 13; other dynasties, fol. 327^b, last line.
- gMt.* Nos. 406-7, E 3551-2. Modern. Much like *fMt.* Paurava kings, vol. i, fol. 79^a; other dynasties, vol. ii, fol. 437^b.
- hMt.* No. 2831, E 3553. Modern. Contains only the first part of the *Mt.* Fairly well written; some special readings. Only Paurava kings, fol. 166^b, l. 9.
- jMt.* No. 3347, Jackson Collection. Modern. Fairly well written; aptly copied carefully from a damaged MS and so has small blanks: many small errors. Valuable as it has several special readings, which are aptly ancient. Paurava kings, fol. 62^b, l. 6; other dynasties, fol. 330^a, l. 9.
- MSS in the Dekhan College, Poona* (collated for me by a paṇḍit through the kindness of the Professor of Sanskrit at the College).
- kMt.* Skt MS no. 28 of 1871-2. Much like *ceMt.*
- lMt.* Skt MS no. 164 of 1887-91.
- mMt.* Skt MS no. 340 of Viśrama (first collection).

MSS in the British Museum.

- nMt.* Add. 14348. Date, 18th cent. Fairly well written; fairly accurate, though with some carelessness: resembles *cMt.* Paurava kings, fol. 98^b; other dynasties, fol. 508^a.
- pMt.* Add. 26414. Date, 18th cent. Fairly well written and genly correct; closely like *AMt.* Contains only the Preface and Pauravas; begins fol. 42^b.

VĀYU PURĀṆA.

- AVā.* The Ānandaśrama (Poona) edition, 1905. It is based on five copies, the Calcutta edition (marked क; see *CVā* below), and 4 MSS marked ख, ग, घ, and ङ and cited here as *a*¹, *a*², *a*³, and *a*⁴ respectively.
- CVā.* The Bibliotheca Indica edition, Calcutta. It is based on 6 MSS, but only rarely notes variant readings.
- avā.* See *AVā.*

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- ūVā.* Wilson 120; Auf. Cat. no. 104. Date, early 19th cent. Fairly well written, but with a good many mistakes and not a few repetitions. Account begins, fol. 237^a, l. 4.
- cVā.* Wilson 355; Auf. Cat. no. 103. Date 15th cent. Unfortunately contains nothing about these dynasties.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- īVā.* Jones MS; W 6a, T 37. Date, end of 18th cent. Valuable, because aptly copied from one MS and corrected by another: yet not accurate. Account begins, vol. ii, fol. 386^a, l. 9.

- *eVā.* Jones MS; W 6b, T 38. Not dated. Writing fairly good, but diction rather illiterate. Very valuable, because it has readings different from the printed editions, and some verses not contained therein; and where it differs therefrom, it often agrees with the Mt (see Introdn. § 22). Unfortunately it has a lacuna at the beginning. Account begins, fol. 198^a, l. 11.
- fVā.* No. 1869, E 3587. Date, about 1600. Fairly well written, but many small errors. It has a large lacuna at the beginning, and commences in fol. 358^b, l. 5 with l. 23 of the Aikṣvākus.
- gVā.* No. 2103, E 3589. Dated 1483. Fairly well written. Account begins, fol. 311^b, l. 10.
- hVā.* No. 1310, E 3590. Modern. Full of mistakes, especially at the beginning; agrees closely with *bVā* even in the errors.
- jVā.* No. 264, E 3591. Date, about 1800. Badly written, full of mistakes and gaps; has a lacuna at the beginning and commences only with l. 23 of the Aikṣvākus in fol. 347^a, l. 7.

MSS in the Dekhan College, Poona (collated for me by a paṇḍit through the kindness of the Professor of Sanskrit at the College).

- bVā.* Skt MS no. 8 of 1874-5. Has lost all the account after l. 17 on p. 48.
- lVā.* Skt MS no. 110 of 1881-2.

MS in the Royal Asiatic Society.

- mVā.* Tod 14. Writing poor, with many small mistakes; much like *fVā*.

VIṢṆU PURĀṆA.

- CVṣ.* The edition by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgar, Calcutta, 1882. Has a commentary, but no notes of variant readings.

MSS in the Bodleian Library.

- aVṣ.* Wilson 26; Auf. Cat. no. 112. Date, 18th cent. Beautifully written in Bengali characters. Account begins, fol. 102^a.
- bVṣ.* Wilson 108; Auf. Cat. no. 109. Dated 1703. Fairly well written and fairly correct. Much like *aVṣ*.
- cVṣ.* Wilson 107; Auf. Cat. no. 110. Dated 1740. Writing good but careless: close to *CVṣ*.
-
- dVṣ.* Wilson 130; Auf. Cat. no. 111. Date, late 18th cent. Well written and fairly correct: close to *CVṣ*.

MSS in the India Office Library.

- eVṣ.* No. 420, E 3606. Dated 1770. Writing poor, with not a few mistakes.
- fVṣ.* No. 1380, E 3607. Modern. Fairly good.
- gVṣ.* No. 1695, E 3608. Modern. Well written and accurate.
- hVṣ.* Burnell MS no. 374. Fairly well written, with some variant readings.

MSS in the Indian Institute, Oxford.

- jVṣ. Malan MS; cat. no. 122. Date, 18th cent. Writing poor, with many small blunders and omissions, some of which have been corrected by a later hand in Bengali writing.
- kVṣ. Cat. no. 121. Dated 1736 (?). Fairly well written and genly correct, but has strange mistakes at times, probably through defects of the MS copied: contains several interesting readings.

MS in the Royal Asiatic Society.

- IVṣ. Whish MS no. 33. From South India; written on palm leaves in modern Grantha. Well and carefully written, but often shortens the connecting phrases in the first half, and omits the Bārhadhrathas: agrees often with kVṣ. A valuable MS, which checks the readings of North Indian MSS. Account begins, fol. 166^a, l. 7.

ABBREVIATIONS.

- * (prefixed) denotes a hypothetical word.
 † (prefixed) denotes a corrupt reading.
 apptly = apparently.
 crp = corrupt, corruptly.
 genly = generally.

- | | |
|------|-----------------------|
| MBh | = Mahābhārata. |
| Pkt | = Prakrit. |
| prob | = probable, probably. |
| Skt | = Sanskrit. |
| syll | = syllable. |

THE PURĀṆA TEXT

OF THE

DYNASTIES OF THE KALI AGE

PREFACE

The Matsya and Vāyu Purāṇas introduce a preface into the middle of the account of the Paurava dynasty. Both bring the Paurava (or Aila) genealogy from the Pāṇḍavas to Abhimanyu, Parīkṣit, and Janamejaya¹, and then describe Janamejaya's dispute with Vaiśampāyana and the brahmins about his Vājasaneyaka doctrine². They then continue the genealogy to Adhisīmakṛṣṇa, in whose reign was performed the twelve-year sacrifice during which these Purāṇas profess to have been recited³. At this point the rishis ask the Sūta for a full account of the Kali age⁴, and he proposes to give it in verses which are here treated as the Preface⁵. Then starting from Adhisīmakṛṣṇa as the existing king, he carries on the dynasty to its close⁶. In order to simplify the arrangement, the prefatory portion is placed here first, and the separated parts of the Paurava genealogy are joined together in a continuous account and given next as the Paurava line. The story of Janamejaya's dispute⁷, the rishis' questions, and the Sūta's resumption of his account are omitted as superfluous⁸. The Preface therefore consists of—

Text—AMt 50, 72–76 ; AVā 99, 264–269.

All copies contain this preface, except that AMt omits lines 6–10; AMt misplaces l. 11 after l. 5; eVā has lost the first 5½ lines and it alone contains ll. 12–14; gVā omits l. 11; and fjmVā have nothing. All agree in the text except where noted, and where the Matsya and Vāyu are different, both versions are given, the Matsya on the left and the Vāyu on the right. The Brahmaṇḍa has lost the preface in a large lacuna. The Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata, and Garuḍa have no preface.

¹ AMt 50, 57; AVā 99, 249b–250a.

² AMt 50, 58–64; AVā 99, 250b–255.

³ AMt 50, 65–67; AVā 99, 256–259.

⁴ AMt 50, 68–71; AVā 99, 260–263.

⁵ AMt 50, 72–76; AVā 99, 264–269.

⁶ AMt 50, 77–89; AVā 99, 270–280a.

⁷ This is given in Appendix III as it shows some brahmanical tampering with the Vāyu.

⁸ See Introdn. § 14.

Sūta uvāca—

Yathā me¹ kīrtitam pūrvam² Vyāsen-ākliṣṭa³-karmanā
bhāvyaṁ⁴ Kali-yugaṁ⁵ cāiva tathā manvantarāṇi ca⁶
anāgatāni⁷ sarvāṇi bruvato me nibodhata
ata ūrdhvam⁸ pravakṣyāmi bhaviṣyā ye⁹ nṛpās tathā¹⁰
Aid-Ēkṣvākv-anvaye¹¹ cāiva Ailāmś¹² cāiva tath-Ēkṣvākūn¹³
Paurave cānvaye¹⁴ tathā Saudyumnāmś¹⁵ cāiva pārthivān
yeṣu¹⁶ sanisthāpyate¹⁷ kṣatram¹⁸ Aid-Ēkṣvāku¹⁹-kulam²⁰ śubham²¹
tān sarvān kīrtayisyāmi²² Bhaviṣye²³ kathitān²⁴ nṛpān²⁵ 7
tebhyo 'pare 'pi ye²⁶ cānye²⁷ utpatsyante nṛpāḥ punaḥ²⁸
kṣatrāḥ²⁹ pārasavāḥ³⁰ sūdrās tathānye ye³¹ vahiṣ-carāḥ³²
Andhrāḥ³³ Śakāḥ Pulindās ca Cūlikā³⁴ Yavanās tathā³⁵ 10

¹ Yath-aiva in jMt.

² So Mt. Vā sarvam.

³ So Mt. Vā ādibhuta.

⁴ Bhāvaṁ in eMt; kMt bhavet.

⁵ Yuge in cejnMt.

⁶ So Mt. Vā tu.

⁷ Atr-āgatāni in lMt.

⁸ Param in jMt.

⁹ So Mt genly: bdMt bhaviṣy-ārthe; cejnMt bhāvino ye. Vā bhaviṣyanti. For this half line lMt reads bhaviṣyān kathitān (nṛpān omitted) as in l. 7.

¹⁰ Smṛtāḥ in fjtMt. Vā tu ye.

¹¹ So a²a⁴bcfnMt; CGVgpmT °k-anvaye; cMt Ail-Ēk°; jMt +Ain-Ēk°; hMt +Aināḥ°; dMt +Ed-Ēk°; nMt crp: a³kMt Aid-Ēkṣvāku-nṛpe: a¹Mt Ikṣvākor anvaye: lMt +Ēkṣakasya. Aida = Aila.

¹² Elāmś in ghkVā.

¹³ In gVā tath=Aik°.

¹⁴ But nMt vānvaye; eMt c-ānya[ta]ye. This is pleonastic because the Pauravas were Ailas, see JRAS, 1910, pp. 16, 20.

¹⁵ This reading is better. The Saudyumnas were distinct from the Ailas and Aikṣvākus, being the descendants of Sudyumna, who was Manu's daughter Ilā when she gained man's form according to the fable; and they comprised the early kings of Gayā and the eastern region, Utkala and perhaps a country named Haritāśva or Vinatāśva in the west: see one version in Mt 12, 17-18; and another in Vā 85, 19, Bḍ iii, 60, 18-19, and Hariv. 10, 632.

¹⁶ In hMt yehi (Pkt for yebhiḥ?).

¹⁷ So Vā, ceMt: Mt genly sanisthāsyate.

¹⁸ So a²-Vā; Ca'dghklVā kṣetram, a frequent mistake for kṣatram. Mt genly tac ca; cefghjnMt tatra.

¹⁹ So Mt genly; jMt Ain-Ēk°: hMt Ail-Ēkṣvākaṁ, eVā °kuṁ: dMt Ed-Ēk°. Vā genly Aikṣvākavaṁ: lMt +Ēkṣakasya.

²⁰ So Mt. Vā idam.

²¹ Śrutān in lMt; smṛtam in dMt.

²² Kathayisyāmi in jMt.

²³ But cMt bhaviṣyān; enMt °ṣyā; jMt °ṣyat: see Introdn. § 7.

²⁴ So Mt. Vā paṭhitān; bVā paṭhito.

²⁵ Nṛpa in bVā.

²⁶ So Mt: nMt omits ye. Vā pare ca ye.

²⁷ So Vā; eVā 'py anye. Mt genly tv anye hy; bcdghjnpMt omit hy.

²⁸ So Mt; eVā nṛpās tathā: Vā genly mahikṣitāḥ.

²⁹ So Mt, Vā genly: cjnMt, eVā kṣatra-; a¹kVā +kṣetrāḥ; eMt +kṣatriyāḥ.

³⁰ So Mt, Vā genly: fjtMt pārasavāḥ, so mMt with pārasavāḥ also; bMt +pārasarāḥ; eVā +pārāsārāḥ; eMt +pāravā; nMt +yāh-ravāḥ; lMt +pāśavī.

³¹ So Mt genly; jMt ca for ye: hMt tathā ye 'nye. Vā tathā ye ca; eVā tathā c-aiva.

³² So Mt genly: Ca'a¹bdmpMt mahiṣvarāḥ. Vā dvijātayaḥ.

³³ So Vā genly, chjlnpMt; fjtMt Andhrāḥ: dhVā, Mt often, Andhāḥ: kVā Adhryāḥ.

³⁴ ACMT Cūlikā; eVā Cūl°; bVā Vūl°; hVā Vūn° (or Vūl°); dVā Vrūl°: Vā genly Tūl°; hMt Dhūl°; jMt Mūl°; bmpMt Cal°; eMt Pulihāṣ; fjtMt Valinkā; dMt Bāhikā:

PAURAVAS

Kaivart-Ābhira-Śabarā ³⁶ ye cānye ³⁷ Mleccha-sambhavāḥ ³⁸
 Pauravā Vitihotrā vai Vaidiśāḥ ³⁹ pañca ⁴⁰ Kosalāḥ
 Mekalāḥ Kosalāḥ Paundrā Gaunardāḥ Svasphrakāś ca ha ⁴¹
 Sunidharmāḥ Śakā Nipā yās cānyā Mleccha-jātayaḥ ⁴²
 varṣ-āgrataḥ ⁴³ pravakṣyāmi ⁴⁴ nāmataś cāiva tām nrpān ⁴⁵.

Pauravas.

Text—AMt 50, 57, 65^a, 66, 78–89 ; AVā 99, 249^b, 250^a, 256^a–258^a, 271–280^a ; Bḍ nil.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 20, 12—21, 4 ; GBh ix, 22, 34–45^a ; CGr i, 140, 40—141, 4.

The arrangement of this dynasty has been explained above (p. 1). In the first portion the Matsya and Vāyu differ, and their versions are both given, the former on the left and the latter on the right ; otherwise they agree except where noted. The Brahṃaṇḍa has lost the whole in a lacuna.

The Bhāgavata is somewhat full about the first seven kings, but combines the rest in a succinct list. The Viṣṇu agrees closely with it. The Garuḍa gives merely a list of names.

All copies of Mt give the whole except lines 5, 27 ; and besides eMt omits l. 28 (second half) to l. 30 (first half) ; fMt ll. 10 and 17 (second half) to 20 (first half) ; and gMt l. 10. The Vā MSS are complete, except that eVā has lost ll. 1–6, 11 (first half) and 16 (second half) to 18 (first half) : all copies, except eVā, omit

gVā omits this half line. *Cūlikā* appears to be the best form, see JRAS, 1912, p. 711.

³⁶ So Mt. Vā *Yavanaiḥ saha*.

³⁷ So Mt, Vā genly (*Śabarā* or *Śarā*) ; eVā *Kaivartt-Āraibhira-varāḥ* ; nMt *Kaivart-Ābhira-Śabaro*.

³⁸ So Mt, Vā genly : nMt *ye cānye* : eVā *yās cānyā*, correcting the faulty grammar.

³⁹ So Mt. Vā *jātayaḥ*.

⁴⁰ This line only in eVā, which reads *Rūthotrā vai Vaidikāḥ* ; this should obviously be *Vitihotrā vai Vaidiśāḥ*, and has been emended so. For the Vitihotras see *Pradyotas*, line 1, *infra* ; for Vaidiśas see *Dynasties of Vidiśā*, &c., *infra*.

⁴¹ *Pañca* suggests that *Pañcālas* are meant, and that this name has been in some way curtailed. For them see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, line 2, *infra*.

⁴² This line only in eVā. For Mekalas

see *Dynasties of the 3rd Century*, line 5, *infra*.

⁴³ This line is only in eVā.

⁴⁴ So Vā genly, *chjku* Mt. Mt genly *paryāyataḥ*. Other copies intermediate, eMt *varṣāgrataḥ* ; dVā *varṣayataḥ* ; bVā *varṣāyata* ; hVā *varṣayata*. *Varṣ-āgrataḥ* occurs in this context, AVā 99, 261—

varṣ-āgrato 'pi prabrūhi nāmataś cāiva
tām nrpān.

Varṣ-āgra occurs in AVā 21, 16, 21 ; 22, 3 ; where it means the 'total number of years' ; hence *varṣ-āgrataḥ* here, being applied to the kings, would mean 'according to the totals of their years'. *Paryāyataḥ* is also good.

⁴⁵ In kMt *pravakṣyāmi*.

⁴⁶ So Mt genly, Vā : *cek'n* Mt read this half line, *bhaviṣyān* (n, ²gyāt) *kathitān* (l, *kāśikān*) *nrpān*, which should no doubt be *Bhaviṣye kathitān nrpān* ; see l. 7.

ll. 10 and 20 (second half) to 25 (first half); *hVā* omits ll. 15 (second half) to 18 (first half); *hVā* ll. 17 (second half) to l. 20; and *jjmVā* have nothing. Also *adsBh* have nothing; and *abGr* omit all kings after the second Śatānika.

For notices of the earliest of these kings elsewhere see *Introdn. § 2*. The kings named are 29 altogether, 25 from and including *Adhisīmakṛṣṇa*; but the list of *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 6, *infra*, mentions '36 Kauravas'.

Abhimanyoh Parikṣit tu ¹
putraḥ para-puraṁ-jayaḥ
Janamejayaḥ ³ Parikṣitaḥ
putraḥ parama-dhārmikaḥ
Janamejayāc Chatānikas ⁶
tasmāj jajñe sa vīryavān ⁷

putro 'śvamedhadatto 'bhūc ⁸ Chatānikasya vīryavān

putro 'śvamedhadattād vai jātāḥ para-puraṁ-jayaḥ ⁹

Adhisīmakṛṣṇo dharm-ātmā ¹⁰ sāmprataṁ yo ¹¹ mahā-yaśāḥ ¹²

Uttarāyān tu Vairātyām
Parikṣid ¹ Abhimanyu-jah ²
Parikṣitas tu dāyādo ⁴
rāj-āsij ⁵ Janamejayaḥ
tasya putraḥ Śatāniko ⁶
balavān satya-vikramaḥ

5

¹ *Parikṣita-su-* in *mMt*. All agree in this name. *Parikṣit*'s name is often written in the MSS in other ways, as *Parikṣita*, *Parikṣi*, *Parikṣa*, &c.; these variations are left unnoticed here. *Bh* begins with a verse about his birth as told in the *MBh*, and *Vṣ* amplifies it in high literary style.

² *Abhimanyuṇā* in *bVā*.

³ All agree in this name. There is a redundant syllable in this and the next line, and it occurs elsewhere with the name *Janamejaya*. The name was sometimes treated as *Janmejaya* (as in *cejjMt* here), thus obviating the superfluous syllable.

⁴ *Parikṣitasya* (omitting *tu*) in *bVā*. *Bh* says *Parikṣit* had three other sons—

Tav-ēme tanayās tāta Janamejaya-pūrvakāḥ

Śrutaseno Bhīmasena Ugrasenaś ca vīryavān.

Vīrasena for *Bhīmasena* in *rtBh*. *Vṣ* concurs in this; so also *MBh* i, 3, 661–2.

⁵ *Rājā sa* in *kVā*.

⁶ All agree in this name. *Vṣ* styles him *aparaḥ Śatānikaḥ*, with reference to an earlier Śatānika, who was son of *Nakula* and *Draupadi* and was killed in the great battle. *Bh* is fuller and contains these two lines—

tasya putraḥ Śatāniko Yājñavalkyāt
trayīm pathan

astra-jñānaṁ kriyā-jñānaṁ Śaunakāt
param esyati.

Vṣ agrees, and expands this statement, improving it by reading *Kṛpāj jñānaṁ* instead of *kriyā-jñānaṁ*. *MBh* says *Janamejaya* had a second son, *Śaṅkukarṇa* (i, 95, 3837–8).

⁷ *Su-vīryavān* in *jMt*.

⁸ So *Vā*; *hMt* agrees but has *vai* for 'bhūc'. *Mt* crp *ath-śvamedhena tataḥ* (*fgMt sutah*); *hMt* omits this line. *Vṣ* and *Gr* give the name as *śvamedhadatta*; *kVā* °dātṛ; *Bh* as °medhaja. Between him and the preceding Śatānika *Bh* inserts a king *Sahasrānika* thus—

Sahasrānikas tat-putras tataś caiv-śvamedhajah:

but no other authority supports it.

⁹ So *Vā*: *kVā pura-puraṁ*°. *Mt* omits this line, condensing it with the next.

¹⁰ So *Vā* except that the name varies; all have a superfluous syllable: *hVā Adhisīmaka-ṛṣṇo*; *Ca*°*a*°*Vā* °sāmaka°; *gVā* °sāmakaḥ *ṛṣṇo*; *a*°*Vā* °māsaka°; *a*°*Vā* °masaka°; *kVā Adhimaka*°. *Mt* genly *jajñe 'dhisomakṛṣṇakhyah*; *fgMt* °simaka°; *jMt* both; *eMt* °simah *ṛṣṇ*°; *nMt* + *Adhinsamak*°; *pMt* *Adhisomakṛṣṇāsyah*; *bMt* °ṛṣṇasya; *dMt* °simah *ṛṣṇāsyah*; *gMt* °simakṛṣṇaś ca; *hMt* āsīt *ṛṣṇa sutas tasya*: *jMat* misplaces this line after l. 3. *Mt* readings seem to

Adhisimakṛṣṇa-putro¹³ Nicakṣur¹⁴ bhavitā nṛpaḥ¹⁵

Gaṅgayāpahṛte¹⁶ tasmin nagare Nāgasāhvaye¹⁷

tyaktvā Nicakṣur nagaram¹⁸ Kauśāmbiyām sa¹⁹ nivatsyati²⁰

bhaviṣyāṣṭau²¹ sūtās tasya²² mahā-bala-parākramāḥ²³

10

Bhūrī²⁴ jyeṣṭhaḥ²⁵ sutas tasya
tasya²⁷ Citrarathaḥ²⁸ smṛtaḥ

bhaviṣyad Uṣṇas tat-putra²⁶

Uṣṇac Citrarathaḥ²⁸ smṛtaḥ

be corruptions of *Adhisimakṛṣṇo'sya* in Pkt form *°kṛṣṇa asya*. Vṣ *Adhisimakṛṣṇa*; kVṣ *°sīmah Kṛṣṇ°*; Gr *°sīmakah Kṛṣṇ°*. Bh *Asimakṛṣṇas tasyāpī*; hBh *Aśīśāk°*; fBh *avātsit Kṛṣṇ°*; gBh *erp*. In two later lines (omitted here) *a'a'a'Mt* (verse 77) and *a'a'Vā* (verse 270) have *Adhisimak°*. The correct name appears to be *Adhisimakṛṣṇa*, with a shorter form *Asimak°*. The longer form is best supported here, though the shorter would improve the metre.

¹¹ So Mt: jMt *sa*. Vā *sāmprato 'yam*. See corresponding lines about Divākara of the Aikṣvākus and Senājī of the Bārhadrathas, *infra*.

¹² So Vā, Mt genly: *a'ceknMt mahārathah*. After this line Mt and Vā insert three lines stating that the twelve-year sacrifice was performed during his reign; see *Introdn.* § 10.

¹³ So Mt, Vā, except that there are variations in the name; cMt adds *'bhūt* and *CGVā'a'jMt tu* superfluously: *a'a'deMt*, *ghVā Adhisimāḥ Kṛṣṇa-putro*; kMt *°māsah K°*; dVā *Asimak°*; nMt merely *Kṛṣṇa-putro*; eVā *Dadhīciḥ Kṛṣṇa-suto*. Bh says *tat-sutah*, 'son of the preceding'.

¹⁴ There is great variation in this name here and in l. 9. Mt often *Vīrakṣu*; byMt *Vīcakṣus*; dMt both; hMt *Nṛcakru*; a'cenMt *Nṛcaka*: afterwards fMt *Nīcakṣus*, lMt *Nṛcakṣu*, kMt *Nṛcaka*. Vā genly *Nīrvaktra*; eVā *Nṛadha* here. Vṣ genly *Nīcakṣus*; bdeffjVṣ, jMt, tBh *Nīcakru*; lVṣ *Nīścakru*; kVṣ *erp*: aGr *+Nīvadra?*; bGr *+Nīcaka?*; CGr *Anīrudha*. Bh genly *Nemīcakra*; eBh *Nemīśc°*; nBh *Naimic°*; rBh, aVṣ *Nīc°*. I have adopted *Nīcakṣus* as the most central form; but the true name may be *Nṛcakṣas*, a word occurring in *Rigv.* x, 14, 11.

¹⁵ So Mt. Vā *kila*.

¹⁶ So Vā, cenMt. Mt genly *Gaṅgayā tu*

hṛte; bMt *°dhṛte*; mMt both; dMt *brte*.

¹⁷ Similarly Vṣ—yo Gaṅgayāpahṛte Hastināpure Kauśāmbiyām nivatsyati. Bh also—Gaṅgāhvaye hṛte nadyā Kauśāmbiyām sādhu vatsyati:

where gBh *°sa tu rat°*; rBh *°sa nivat°*; pBh ends *neṣyati*.

¹⁸ So Mt genly with variations in the name, see note¹⁴: *a'a'ceknMt Nṛcako nagaram tyaktvā*; hMt *°svam vaimśam tyaktvā*; eVā *tyaktvā Nṛbandhu vāsam* (with a syll. lost). Vā genly *tyaktvā (gVā kṛtvā) ca tam sa vāsam ca*; CVā *°su-vāsam°*; dVā *'tam tu vāsam svam*; hVā *'nam surcāsa va*; bVā *'nyāttakam'kām ca nam sa vāsa va*. These variations suggest the reading, *tyaktvā ca tam sa-vāsam* (or *vaimśam*) *ca*.

¹⁹ So Vā genly (gVā omits *sa*) and rBh; lVā *+Kauśāmbiyām°*; fMt *sa Kauśāmbiyām*; gMt *sa Kauśaryā*. Mt genly *Kauśāmbiyām tu*; jMt *°su*; dMt *+Kauśānām*; hMt *+Kauśālyāntu*. Vṣ, Bh corroborate; eBh *+Kauśīkyām*; kVṣ *Kauśak°*.

²⁰ So Mt, Vā genly, Vṣ: bVā *nīveṣyati*; hVā *nīveṣ°*; dVā *nīveśmanī*; gVā *sannīvetṣyati*.

²¹ This line is only in Mt, but not in dfjMt: *a'Mt bhaviṣyāś ca*; hMt *°sye yah*; mpMt *'zyūkṣau*; kMt omits *āṣṭau*: eVā has only the first half line, *bhaviṣyas tu sutas tasmāt*.

²² *Caiya* in a'Mt.

²³ In hMt *Uṣṇa Citraratha smṛtaḥ*.

²⁴ *Bhūri* in bdfjgkpMt; hMt *Bhūri*; lMt *Bhūmī*.

²⁵ In hMt *śreṣṭhaḥ*.

²⁶ So Vā. Vṣ *tasyāpy Uṣṇaḥ putro*. CGr *Uṣṇa*; abGr *Uśca?*; Bh *Ukta*; tBh *Upta*.

²⁷ *Tatas* in bcefglhpMt; mMt both; jMt *tatra*.

²⁸ All agree in this name, except eVā *Tvaṣṭā Dhitrarathaḥ*.

Śucidrathas²⁹ Citrarathād³⁰ Vṛṣṇimānīs³¹ ca Śucidratlāt
 Vṛṣṇimataḥ Suṣeṇas³² ca³² bhaviṣyati śucir nṛpaḥ³³
 tasmāt Suṣeṇād bhavitā Sunītho³⁴ nāma pārthivah³⁵
 Rucalḥ³⁶ Sunīthād³⁷ bhavitā³⁸ Nṛcakṣur³⁹ bhavitā tataḥ⁴⁰ 15
 Nṛcakṣuṣas⁴¹ tu dāyādo bhavitā vai⁴² Sukhībalaḥ⁴³
 Sukhībala-sutaś c'āpi⁴⁴ bhāvi⁴⁵ rājā Pariplavaḥ⁴⁶
 Pariplava-sutaś c'āpi⁴⁷ bhavitā Sunayo⁴⁸ nṛpaḥ

²⁹ So Vā, fJMt; CGr agrees: *ceghnMt Śucidratha*; *a'a'kMt Suwid°*; *hVs* either; *bMt*, *kVā Śucidravya*, so *dpMt* with *°dravāt* at the end: other Mt *Śucidrava*. *Vs* genly *Śuciratha*; *eVs Śucir°*. *Bh Kaciratha* and *Kuvir°* about equally; *jBh Turir°*; *fBh Kathir°*; *rsBh Śucir°*. The proper form should probably be *Sucadratha*. Omitted in *dVs*, *abGr*.

³⁰ *Caitrarathō* in *a²a'kMt*; *enMt Cit°*. *Bh* says *sutah*.

³¹ So Mt genly; *Vs*, *fjklqBh*, CGr agree in the name: *mpMt Vṛṣṇumānīs*; *cejnMt Vṛṣṭim°*: in next line *pMt Vṛṣṇimataḥ*; *lMt Vṛṣṭi°*; *nMt Vṛṣi°*. *Vā* genly *Dhṛti-mānīs*; *dVā Dhṛtam°*; *gVā Vṛṭtim°*; *bVā Vṛṭyam°*; *hVā Vṛnam°*; *kVā Vṛtirmāś*. *Bh* genly, *abVs Vṛṣṭimat*; *tBh Vṛti°*; *rlBh Dhṛti°*; *eBh Dhṛṣṭi°*; *cBh Kṛṣṭi°*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³² So Mt genly: *eVā Suṣeṇa Dhṛtimato* (with one syll. short). *Vā* genly *Suṣeṇo vai mahācīryo*. *Bh*, *Vs*, CGr agree in the name; *kVs Susena*. With the dialectical modification of *s*, *cenMt* read *Sukheṇas tu*, so *gVā* and *hVs*; *bVs*, *knpBh Sukheṇa*: *lMt Sukhanas tu*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³³ So Mt genly: *cfyghklmMt punar nṛpaḥ*; *eMt panu°*. *Vā* genly *mahāyāsāḥ*; *eVā punaḥ punaḥ*.

³⁴ So Mt genly, *eVā*. *Vs*, *Bh* agree; CGr *Sunīthaka*; *kBh Sunītha*: *jMt Sunīyo*; *mpMt Sunīpo*, *pMt Sunīthād* in next line. *Vā* genly *Sutirho*. Omitted in *abGr*.

³⁵ *Dhārmikah* in *eVā*.

³⁶ So *Vā* genly; *gVā Ruciḥ*. *Vs* genly *Reaḥ*; *kVs Rita*; *jVs Amca*; *eVā sa vai*. Mt *nṛpāt*. *Bh*, *hVs*, *Gr* omit him.

³⁷ *Sunīto* in *eVā*. *Vā* *Sutīrthād*.

³⁸ *Samjanye* in *kMt*.

³⁹ So Mt genly; *Vs*, *Bh*, *Gr* agree genly: *eknMt Nṛcakra*, *eMt Nuc°*. *Vā* genly *Tri-cakṣo*; *bdVā °vakṣyo*; *gVā Citrākṣo*; *a'klVā*

Vivakṣo; *eVā Nṛvandhur*. Others, *pBh Nṛcakra*; *cBh Nṛpakṣu*; *fBh Sucakṣus*; *aVs Nuc°*, *kVs Nuc°*, *bVs Tric°*: see note ⁴¹.
⁴⁰ So *Vā*. Mt *su-mahāyāsāḥ*; *dMt sa°*; *fghMt tu°*.

⁴¹ Readings here genly follow those in note ³⁹: but *bpMt Nṛcakṣuṣasya* (omitting *tu*), *lMt Vivakṣasas*: *lVā Trivakṣasya*, *kVā °kṣyāsya*, *bVā °vikṣyasya*; *gVā Citrākhyasya*; *eVā Nṛvandhuyas*.

⁴² In *fjMt °ca*: *cehknMt bhaviṣyati*.

⁴³ So Mt, *Vā* genly, here and in next line: *bdVā Suṣib°*; *nMt Sukhīlāva*, *jMt Sukhel°*, *cMt Mukhūl°*; *ekMt na samśayah*: but in next line *eMt Sukhīlāva*, *ekMt °tala*, *bVā Suradhīla*. *Vs* genly *Sukhābala*, *lVs Sukhab°*, *abhkVs Sukhāb°*. *Bh* genly *Sukhānala*, *pBh °nara*; *fBh Suṣinara*; *rBh Sukhānana*. CGr *Mukhābāna*; *aGr Surabala*, *bGr °baja*. This name omitted in *eVā*. After him *Gr* adds, *medhāvi ca nṛpañjayaḥ*, implying apply to two other kings, but no authority supports it.

⁴⁴ In *dVā sutah sūta*; *bVā tśuta[mṛ]tasi*; *ekMt tvaśus c'āpi*. *Bh* *sutas tasmāt*.

⁴⁵ So Mt genly. *Vā*, *enMt bhāryo*, *eMt bha°*; *hMt bhaviṣyati* (omitting *rājā*).

⁴⁶ So many Mt, *a²a'Vā*, here and in next line. *Vs*, *Bh* agree genly; and *abGr*: *bgrtBh*, CGr *Pāriplava*; *Ca'a²Vā Paripluta*. *CGVa²lMt*, *ghVs*, *cBh Pariṣṇava*; *kMt °snura*. The letters *pl* and *ṣn* are often written very much alike; so *eMt °snura* here, *°pluva* in next line: *gVā °pluta*, *°plava*; *kVā °pluva*, *°plava*: *bVā °śraya*, *°plava*; *kVs °puna*; *dVā °ślagha*; *cfVs Paritmuva*: *lVā* substitutes here *Dandapānir bhaviṣyati* from l. 25.

⁴⁷ This line omitted in some, see p. 3.

⁴⁸ So *Vā* genly, *hMt*; *Vs* genly, CGr agree: also *Bh* impliedly, *Medhāvi Sunay-ātmajah*. Mt genly *Sutapā*; *jMt °tamā*: *tBh °tapa*; *pBh °daya*; *kVs °raya*; *kMt °nṛpo*; *eVā*

Medhāvī⁴⁹ tasya dāyādo⁵⁰ bhaviṣyati narādhipaḥ⁵¹

Medhāvīnaḥ sutaś c-āpi⁵² bhaviṣyati Nrpañjayaḥ⁵³

20

Durvo⁵⁴ bhāvyaḥ sutas tasya⁵⁵ Tigmātmā⁵⁶ tasya c-ātmajaḥ⁵⁷

Tigmād⁵⁸ Brhadratho⁵⁹ bhāvyo Vasudāno⁶⁰ Brhadrathāt

Vasudānāc⁶¹ Chatāniko⁶² bhaviṣy-Ōdayanas⁶³ tataḥ⁶⁴

bhaviṣyate c-Ōdayanād⁶⁵ viro rājā⁶⁶ Vahīnaraḥ⁶⁷

Vahīnar-ātmajaś⁶⁸ c-aiva⁶⁹ Daṇḍapāṇir⁷⁰ bhaviṣyati

25

Daṇḍapāṇer Nirāmitro Nirāmitrāt⁷¹ tu⁷² Kṣemakaḥ⁷³

⁴⁹ ratho: bgVā, acdeghVṣ, abGr Munaya; hVā Munaya; lMt Muṣṇavo; ceMt Putrayo; nMt Putrāpo; rBh Vijāna.

⁴⁹ So all: but hBh Modhāvin; kBh Meghāvin.

⁵⁰ So Mt, eVā. Vā genly Sunayasy-ātha; bgVā Munay^o; hVā Munay-ātha. Bh Sunay-ātmajaḥ.

⁵¹ So Vā: eVā nrpaḥ sa tu; hMt nayasya t. Mt genly na samśayaḥ.

⁵² So Mt and Vā.

⁵³ So eVā. Bh, Vṣ, Gr agree. Mt Purañj^o; bVṣ Rīpñj^o; lVṣ Nrpanaya. See p. 3.

⁵⁴ There is great variation in this name. Mt mostly Urvo; ceMt Ūru; hMt Uror; jMt Ūrvyā; gMt Ūrvyan, fMt Ūr^o; nMt Ūru (or Kuru); pMt Kurvo; dMt Jayo. But eVā Durvi. Bh genly Dūrou; nBh Dur^o; clBh Dar^o; rBh Dār^o; pBh Durva. Vṣ genly Mrdu; fVṣ ḍa; hVṣ Durra, lVṣ Dūr^o; abVṣ Durbala; kVṣ Durddharṣa. Gr Harī. Durva is the most central form.

⁵⁵ C-āpi in eVā.

⁵⁶ So Mt genly; eVā shortly Tigmāms. Vṣ, Gr Tigma, which Mt and eVā use in next line. Bh Tīmī; hMt Tīmātmā, ceknMt Nirm^o; fgMt Nirm-ākhyas; jMt +Nin-dātmā.

⁵⁷ In eVā tasmād bhaviṣyati; Bh janīṣyati.

⁵⁸ So Mt genly, eVā: bMt mātmanā, dMt mātmano, with excess syll: pMt Tigmā; hMt Tīnād; cefyknMt Nirmād; jMt +Nindā.

⁵⁹ All agree in this name.

⁶⁰ So hMt, eVā; Vṣ agrees: dMt Vasudānā. Mt genly ḍāmā; kMt ḍhānā; eMt ḍhāmā; cnMt ḍhāmā; jMt ḍevo: lVṣ ḍa; bVṣ manas. CGr Sudānaka; abGr +Tudānava misplacing him after the next king Satānika. Bh Sudāsa indirectly, Satānikah Sudāsa-jah; bBh Sudāru-jah.

⁶¹ So hMt, eVā. Mt genly ḍāmnah; bM

ḍāmnā; cnMt ḍhāmā; cMt ḍhāmā; jMt ḍāsnā.

⁶² All agree; eMt Saḥ: abGr Sadānika, Pkt. Vṣ calls him aparāḥ Satānikah; for the former see note⁶. Bh says 'son of the preceding', see note⁶⁰.

⁶³ So Mt genly; Vṣ: eVā-bhaviz-Ōdayan-ya[ṇ]s here, Udayanād in next line: jMt bhaviṣy-Ōdayināḥ; eMt syudayanah; dmpMt sy-Ōdathanah; kMt syatanayah. CGr Uḍāna. Bh genly Durdamaṇa; enBh Durd^o or Urd^o; clBh Umanasu (or Dum^o).

⁶⁴ Tathā in bekjnpMt, eVā.

⁶⁵ See note⁶³. Other variations here are, cjpMt syutaś c^o (so kMt erp); CMT syate ca Dayanād; dpMt c-Ōdathanād; eMt bhaviṣy c-Ōdayanād; eVā bhaviṣyāś c-āpy Udayanād.

⁶⁶ Jāto in dMt.

⁶⁷ So Mt genly; Bh, abVṣ agree: pBh Vrahī^o; Vṣ genly Ahī^o; hVṣ Ahā^o; CGr Ahnā^o; glBh Vahīmana; ceknMt Mahīnaraḥ, fgMt rataḥ, here and in next line.

⁶⁸ So Mt; eVā ra-sutaś: lMt Mahīsar-ātm^o.

⁶⁹ C-āpi in eVā; mpMt c-Aindro.

⁷⁰ So Mt; and Vā which resumes the list here. Bh, bklVṣ, CGr agree. Vṣ genly Khaṇḍa^o; fVṣ that or Khadya^o.

⁷¹ So Vā, CbdefyjnMt; jVṣ. ApMt, bghVṣ Nirā^o; hMt Nirva^o. Vṣ genly Narā^o; aVṣ Nī^o. CGr Nimitaka. Bh genly, klVṣ Nimi; clBh Nima; nBh Nini; tBh Nidhi; jBh Niti; rBh Muni. This half line in eVā is bhaviṣy Kṣemakas tathā.

⁷² So Mt. Vā ca.

⁷³ All agree in this name; but lVṣ Kṣema; a'a'ghVā Kṣepakaḥ; jVṣ, lBh Kṣamaka; kVṣ Cākṣuka. All agree in Kṣemaka in l. 30.

pañca-vimśā⁷⁴ nṛpā hy ete⁷⁵ bhaviṣyāḥ Pūru⁷⁶-vaimśa-jāḥ
 atrānuvaimśa⁷⁷-śloko 'yam gito vipraiḥ purāṇaiḥ⁷⁸
 brahma-kṣatrasya⁷⁹ yo yonir vaimśo⁸⁰ deva-rṣi⁸¹-satkṛtaḥ⁸²
 Kṣemakam prāpya rājānaṁ saṁsthām prāpsyati vai Kalau⁸³ 30
 ity eṣa Pauravo vaimśo⁸⁴ yathāvad anukīrtitaḥ⁸⁵
 dhīmataḥ Pāṇḍu-putrasya Arjunasya⁸⁶ mahātmanaḥ⁸⁷.

Aikṣvākus.

Text—AMt 271, 4–17^a; AVā 99, 280^b–293; Bḍ iii, 74, 104–107^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 22; GBh ix, 12, 9–16; CGr i, 141, 5–8.

The Matsya and Vāyu give the whole. The Brahmāṇḍa has a lacuna and its account begins only at l. 23. The Bhāgavata gives a list of names with a few particulars. The Viṣṇu and Garuḍa have only a list of names.

Line 1 is only in Vā. Otherwise all copies of Mt and Vā have the dynasty complete, except that jMt omits ll. 4–7; eVā ll. 19–21; gVā ll. 5, 7–14, 24, 25; lVā l. 24; hMt have lost the whole; and jVmVā begin only at l. 23. In jBh kings Śākya to Kṣudraka (inclusive) are omitted; in nBh Śākya to Suratha; in pBh Ranañjaya to Śuddhodana; in eVṣ Śākya to Kulaka; in kVṣ all after Śākya except the genealogical verse; and adBh have nothing.

There is confusion regarding the first two kings, for Vā, Vṣ, and Bh name two, but Mt and Gr make them one only. This piece of the dynasty, with so much of the various readings as concerns these two kings, stands thus:—

⁷⁴ This line is only in Vā; dVā °śa gVā °śa: eVā °trīmśan. These 25 kings are Adhisimākṛṣṇa and his successors, see l. 6; but see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 6, *infra*.

⁷⁵ *Nrp-ādya te in bVā.*

⁷⁶ Vā genly *pūruva*; eVā *Puru*. The correct reading is clearly *Pūru*, from whom the Pauravas were descended.

⁷⁷ In hMt °vaimśaḥ; nMt °vaimśya: bdpMt ato 'nuvaimśa-ḥ; eVā tatrān°: dVā *Puru-vaimśasya*; kVā *anuv*°, hVā °śayā: gVā omits *atra*.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly; nMt *tsurāt*°; fgMt *sanāt*°. Vā genly *purā-vidaiḥ*; eVā *purāṇikaḥ* *dvijaiḥ*.

⁷⁹ This verse is in Mt, Vā, Vṣ, Bh.

⁸⁰ In hMt *yā yonir*°; BrtBh *vai yonir*°. Bh genly *vai prokto*°; bfhjknpgBh *vaimśo 'yam prokto*.

⁸¹ Vṣ *rājarsi*; aVṣ *devarsi*.

⁸² In nMt *saṁk*°; eMt *saṁsk*°; eMt *tsajñitah*; kMt *tsamjñinaḥ*.

⁸³ So Vā, Bh, lVṣ. Mt MSS have two endings (1) *saṁsthāsyati Kalau yuge*, (2) *saṁsthāsyati sa* (or *ca*) *vai Kalau*; jMt °sthāpyanti *ca ye*°. Vṣ *sa saṁsthām* (*k, saṁsthānam*) *prāpsyate Kalau*. Cf. p. 12, note 79.

⁸⁴ But eVā *ity evam Pauravaṁ vaimśam*.

⁸⁵ So Vā, ceknMt; eVā °tam. Mt genly *iha kīrtitaḥ*.

⁸⁶ So Vā, Mt genly; AbklmMt *c-Ārjunasya*; dVā *dharma-jñasya*; eVā reads this half line *Pārthasya prathit-ātmanaḥ*.

⁸⁷ Gr after naming Kṣemaka says, *tataḥ śūdraḥ pitā pūruva tataḥ sutah*, suggesting that two śūdra kings, father and son, reigned after him.

- *Mt.* Bṛhadbalasya dāyādo vīro rājā hy ¹ Urukṣayaḥ ²
Urukṣayaḥ³-sutas⁴ c'āpi ⁴ Vatsadroho mahāyasaḥ ⁵.
- Vā.* Bṛhadrathasya ⁶ dāyādo vīro rājā Bṛhatkṣayaḥ ⁷
tataḥ Kṣayaḥ sutas ⁸ tasya Vatsavyūhas tataḥ Kṣayāt.
- Vṣ.* Vṛhadbalasya putro Vṛhatkṣayaḥ ⁹
tasmād Gurukṣepaḥ ¹⁰ tato Vatsaḥ ¹¹ Vatsād Vatsavyūhaḥ.
- Bh.* Bṛhadbalasya bhavitā putro nāma Bṛhadraṇaḥ ¹²
Urukriyas ¹³ tatas tasya Vatsavyrddho bhaviṣyati.
- Gr.* Vṛhadbalād ¹⁴ Urukṣayo Vatsavyūhas tataḥ paraḥ.

A comparison of these readings with possible mistakes in letters in the various old scripts suggests that Vā, Bh, and Vṣ are right in naming two kings, that their names appear to be Bṛhatkṣaya and Urukṣaya, and that Mt and Gr have confused them as one. Hence it seems the text of Mt and Vā should be emended thus:—

Bṛhadbalasya dāyādo vīro rājā Bṛhatkṣayaḥ
Urukṣayaḥ sutas tasya Vatsavyūha Urukṣayāt.

The number of kings in this dynasty is not stated, but 29 are named, excluding Siddhārtha: see however *Early Contemporary Dynasties, infra*.

- Ata ūrdhvam pravakṣyāmi Ikṣvākūṇām mahātmanām ¹
Bṛhadbalasya ² dāyādo vīro rājā Bṛhatkṣayaḥ ³
Urukṣayaḥ ⁴ sutas tasya Vatsavyūha ⁴ Urukṣayāt
Vatsavyūhāt ⁵ Prativyomas ⁶ tasya putro ⁷ Divākarah ⁸

¹ Hy omitted in *bedefgjkMt*.

² In *jMt* *Urūk°*; *dkMt* *Kuruk°*; *ceMt* *Nurak°*;
lMt *Nuk°*.

³ See note ²; *eMt* *Surak°*: *nMt* *Urukṣayas*.

⁴ In *nMt* *tu tasy-āpi*.

⁵ In *gMt* *mamā°*; *nMt* *mahātāpāh*.

⁶ *Bṛhadbalasya* in *eVā*.

⁷ In *hVā* *°tkṣavaḥ*; *dVā* *°tvayaḥ*; *bVā*
°drathah.

⁸ *Kṣaya sutas* in *bVā*: *eVā* omits this line.

⁹ In *kVṣ* *°kṣvenaḥ*; *gVṣ* *°kṣetraḥ*; *bVṣ*
°kṣantaḥ; *fVṣ* *Bṛhatkṣayaḥ*.

¹⁰ So *dVṣ* or *Urūk*: *jVṣ* *Urukṣaprah*:
abhVṣ *Urukṣayaḥ*; *kVṣ* *Varūk°*; *lVṣ* + *Puru-*
ṣak°.

¹¹ But *lVṣ* omits him.

¹² In *hBh* *°eranaḥ*; *cBh* *Dharudraṇaḥ*.

¹³ In *cBh* *°kriśas?*; *hBh* *Kurukriyas*; *rBh*
Upāvṛttas.

¹⁴ *Vṛhanraṇād* in *abGr*.

¹ This line is only in *Vā*. *Vṣ*, *Gr* have
similar statements.

² *Vā* genly, *fgMt* *°rathasya*, but *Bṛhadbala*
correctly in l. 24. *Bṛhadbala*, king of Kosala,
is mentioned in the MBh.

³ For this line, see above.

⁴ So *Vā* genly, *a'e'a'bkMt*. *Vṣ*, *Gr* agree.
In *klVā* *°vyūhās*; *fgMt* *°vyāho*, *dMt* *°dāho*,
in next line *dgMt* *°dyāhāt*; *jMt* *erp*; *eMt*
Vasavyūho; *nMt* *Vṛtsamūho* and *Vatsavyū-*
hāt. *Mt* genly *Vatsadroho*: *Bh* *°vṛddha*,
tBh *°vriha*: *hVṣ* *Vyūha*. *Vṣ* (except *lVṣ*)
inserts a king Vatsa before him (see above),
but no other authority supports it.

⁵ *Vyūdhāt* merely in *eVā*.

⁶ So *Mt* genly. *Vṣ*, *Bh*, *abGr* agree. In
eVā *Prativyomnas tu*. *Vā* genly, *lVṣ*
°vyūhas; *gMt* *°vyogo*; *rBh* *°vyota*; *jVṣ*
°vyoma; *kVṣ* *Prativyāma*. *CGr*, *hVṣ* omit
him.

⁷ *Vyoma-putro* in *fgMt*.

⁸ So *Mt*, *Vā*, *Vṣ*. *Bh* *Bhāmur Divāko*
rākinū-patiḥ, where *BepBh* read correctly
Divārko. *Sūrya* in *abGr*. *CGr*, *hVṣ* omit
him.

tasyaiva⁹ Madhyadeśe tu

Ayodhyā nagari śubhā

Divākarasya bhavitā¹¹ Sahadevo¹² mahā-yaśāḥ

Sahadevasya¹³ dāyādo¹⁴ Bṛhadaśvo¹⁵ mahā-manāḥ¹⁶

tasya Bhānuratho bhāvyaḥ¹⁷ Pratītāśvaś¹⁸ ca tat-sutaḥ

Pratītāśva-sutaś cāpi Supratīko¹⁹ bhaviṣyati

Marudevaḥ²⁰ sutas tasya²¹ Sunakṣatraś²² ca tat-sutaḥ²³

Kinnarāśvaḥ²⁴ Sunakṣatrād bhaviṣyati param-tapaḥ

Kinnarād Antarikṣas tu²⁵

bhaviṣyati mahā-manāḥ²⁷

Suśeṇaś²⁸ cĀntarikṣāc ca²⁹

Sumitraś cāpy³² Amitrajit³³

yaś ca sāmpratam adhyāste

Ayodhyān¹⁰ nagarīm nṛpaḥ

| bhavitā cĀntarikṣas tu²⁶

Kinnarasya suto mahān

Antarikṣāt Suparnaś³⁰ tu³¹

Suparnāc cāpy³⁴ Amitrajit³³

10

⁹ So Mt genly: °aiśā in cdefgmMt. Cf corresponding lines about Adhiśimakṣṇa (p. 4, l. 6) and Senājī (p. 15, l. 13).

¹⁰ So Vā: gVā omits this line.

¹¹ Sahitā in eMt.

¹² So all, except that gVā reads—

Divākara-sutaś cāpi cakravartī bhaviṣyati. CGr, hVs omit him.

¹³ In CmMt °devāc ca.

¹⁴ So Vā. Mt bhavitā.

¹⁵ So Vā. Vś, Bh, Gr agree: hVs °dratha. Mt genly Dhruvāśvo vai; cenMt °v-ākhyo: hVs omits him.

¹⁶ So Mt: cenMt °yaśāḥ. Vā bhaviṣyati.

¹⁷ So Vā genly; Vś, Gr agree: bhVā Bhātu°. Bh Bhānumant; hBh Vān°. bhVs omit him. Mt corrupts this half line, gjMt bhāvya-ratho bhāvyaḥ, fMt bhāvya°, bMt bhāvya°, dmMt bhāvya rathā°, lMt °rathodbhāv°: genly bhāvya mahābhāyaḥ. Vś says, 'son of the preceding', tat-sūnur.

¹⁸ So Vā, bdfgmMt; abhklVs agree. Mt genly Pratīpāśvaś; kMt Pratītā°. In bBh Pratīkāśva: Bh genly Pratīkāśva; cflhknprBh °kāśu: CGr °vya; abGr °cya: jMt Pracetās tasya (omitting ca), but Pratītāśva in next line: lMt marutaś cāpi. Vś genly omits him.

¹⁹ So kMt; Vś, Bh agree. Vā genly Supratīto; eVā °nīto: Mt genly °tīpo; fgMt °tīpo: mMt Supratīto; lMt Suvratopo. CGr Pratītoka; rBh Pratīka; abGr °tikṣaka. Bh says, 'son of the preceding', tat-sutaḥ.

²⁰ So Mt; Vś, Bh agree: jBh Marad°; lVs Maru[da]l°; mMt, Gr, bpBh Manud°; Vā Sahad°; cBh Sahad°.

²¹ Cāpi in eVā.

²² So all; except rBh Sean°; eBh Sutaḥk°; hBh Sunakṣetra: eMt Sukṣatras tat; eMt +Svakṣatrasvat; mMt Sutaḥkas tu, but Sutaḥsatāt in next line; jMt Sutaḥkṣatas, but Sutaḥsatāt in next line.

²³ So Vā: ceMt suto 'bhavat. Mt genly tuto 'bhavat; dknMt °bhavet.

²⁴ So Mt genly, eVā; kMt °raśva: nMt °raś ca; lMt °rāḥ; dMt °rākṣaḥ; fgmMt °r-ākhyah; jMt °rākṣāt. Vā genly Kinnaras tu; Vś, Gr agree: bVā +Kannarasya: rBh Kandara; Bh genly Puskara; kBh °kala; eBh Puspara; lBh Rūskura. But eMt Kinnaras cākṣaras tudrad; so eMt crp.

²⁵ So cdefgjklnMt (with some corruptions); so bMt, but altered to Kinnarāśvād Antarikṣas which ACMt have. Vś, Bh Antarikṣa; bfgjkVś °rikṣa; CGr °rikṣaka: abGr Anurakṣaka.

²⁶ So Vā; kVā °rikṣasya: eVā cĀntarikṣas tu, but Antarikṣāt in next line.

²⁷ Mahāyaśāḥ in dfmMt.

²⁸ So Mt genly: mMt °sarnaś; cekMt °varnaś; dfmMt °parnaś; bMt °parvaś; lMt °pparvaḥ; nMt °kṣatraś; jMt °varnāc.

²⁹ So Mt genly; cenMt °rikṣasya.

³⁰ So Vā: bhVś, Gr agree. Vś Suvarṇa; jVś Sarvāna. Bh Sutapas.

³¹ Tu wanting in eVā.

³² So Mt genly; jMt tu: nMt Sumitrasya-apy; bMt Sumantr°; ceMt Suvarṇ°. Sumitra Amitrajit would be one king.

³³ All agree in this name, except bMt

putras tasya³⁵ Brhadbhrājo³⁶ Dharmī³⁷ tasya sutah smṛtaḥ
putraḥ³⁸ Kṛtañjaya³⁹ nāma Dharmiṇaḥ sa⁴⁰ bhaviṣyati
Kṛtañjaya⁴¹-suto vidvān⁴² bhaviṣyati⁴³ Raṇañjayaḥ⁴⁴
bhavitā Sañjayaś⁴⁵ cāpi⁴⁶ viro rājā Raṇañjayāt
Sañjayasya⁴⁷ sutah Śākyah⁴⁸ Śākyac⁴⁹ Chuddhodano⁵⁰ 'bhavat
Śuddhodanasya⁵² bhavitā Siddhārtho⁵³ Rāhulah⁵⁴ sutah⁵⁵
Prasenajit⁵⁶ tato bhāvyah⁵⁷ Kṣudrako⁵⁸ bhavitā⁵⁹ tataḥ⁶⁰
Kṣudrakāt Kulako⁶¹ bhāvyah Kulakāt⁶² Surathah⁶³ smṛtaḥ⁶⁴

20

Amantrajit; CGr *Kṛtajit*; abGr *Śatajit*:
jMt *tato bhavet*.

³⁴ So Vā; dMt also: dVā *Parṇāc*.

³⁵ So Vā. Mt genly *Sumitra-jo*; bMt
°*triyo*; jMt °*trāt tu*.

³⁶ Mt genly *Brhadrāja*; Vg, Bh genly agree.
But hVg, bqtBh, CGr °*dbhrāja*; hklpBh
°*dbhāja*; nMt, abGr °*dvāja*; fBh °*dgātra*;
cBh °*dbhānu*; gBh °*jjāta*; eBh *Brāhmadrāja*;
cMt, *Mahārāja*. Vā *Bharadvāja*. *Brhad-*
bhrāja appears to be the probable name.

³⁷ So Vā; Vg agrees: eVā *Dharma*; Gr
Dharmika. Mt reads this half line *Brhad-*
rājasya (d, °*rājasya*; n, °*rājusya*) *virgarvān*
(b, *virya-bhāk*; j, *kirtanāt*), where *virgarvān*
is probably a mistake for *Dharmavān* or
Dharmikah; see note ⁴⁰. Bh *Barhis*.

³⁸ So Vā, *Chelejkmm*Mt. Other Mt *pnmah*.

³⁹ So Mt genly, Vā. Vg, Bh, Gr agree.
But fgMt read thus—

Kṛtiñjaya iti khyātah su-putro yo bhavi-
syati:

but fMt *Kṛtañj*° in next line. In bVg
Kṛtiñj°: jMt *Vrhañj*°, but *Kṛtañj*° in next
line.

⁴⁰ So Vā: for *sa* dVā has *sa-*, eVā *tu*.
Mt genly *Dharmikaś ca*; cMt °*keś ca*; nMt
†*tathākaś ca*. Mt reading should probably
be *Dharmikasya* (see note ³⁷). But gVā
reads this half line, *rājā parama-dharmikah*.

⁴¹ In *degVā* °*jayāt*; kVā °*jayā*; lMt *Raṇañ-*
jaya-.

⁴² So Mt. Vā genly *Vrāto*: gVā *suta*
vrāto, dVā °*vrāta*, kVā *vrato*; eVā *svrato*
vai. These suggest a king *Vrāta* or *Suvrata*,
of whom the other authorities know nothing.

⁴³ So Mt. Vā *tasya putro* to accord with
the insertion of *Vrāta*.

⁴⁴ So Vā, *cefykn*Mt; Vg, Bh agree. Mt
genly *Raṇej*°; abGr *Raṇaj*°; gBh *Rṇañj*°;
eVā *Rathāj*°: CGr †*Dhanastraya*.

⁴⁵ So all; but gBh *Suñjaya*: lMt reads
this half line †*Raṇañjayaś capisuno*.

⁴⁶ *Cāto* in bMt.

⁴⁷ *Raṇañjaya-* in *cen*Mt.

⁴⁸ So all genly: but *ced*Mt, *ab*Vg, *ef*Bh
Śak°; bMt *Śāth*°; gMt *Śāj*°; fMt *Śāj*°;
abGr *Kāśyapanya*: kVā omits this name in
a blank.

⁴⁹ So all; except *ce*Mt *Śak*°; *dg*Mt *Śāj*°;
fMt *Śāj*°; lMt *Śāth*°; gVā *rājā*.

⁵⁰ So Vā, *bed*Mt; *bgh*Vg, Gr agree: *efy*Mt
Sud°. Mt genly *Chuddhodan*°; nMt *erp*.
Bh *Suddhoda*. Vg genly *Kruddhodana*;
dVg *Krod*°; aVg *erp*.

⁵¹ So Vā; bVā *bhavet*: eVā *smṛtaḥ*. Mt
genly *nrpaḥ*; *cejn*Mt *pnmah*.

⁵² So Vā, *eden*Mt. Mt genly *Śuddhodan*°;
*bfg*Mt *Suddhod*°.

⁵³ So Mt genly; cMt *Śuddhārdha*, eMt
Śru°. Vā *Śākyārthe*; a'ablkVā *Śak*°. Vg,
Bh, Gr omit him.

⁵⁴ So *Ca'a*Vā; lVg *Rāhula*. Vg genly
Rātula; a'a'dyklVā *Nāhula*; abhVg, CGr
Bāk°; abGr *Vāph*°; bhVā *Nah*°; jVg *Gār*°.
Bh *Laṅgula*. In jMt *Prāhula*; fgMt
Prabhuta; Mt genly *Paṣkula*; eMt *Hasuta*;
kMt *Hasanaḥ* (cMt *sunah*); lMt *Sukrat*.

⁵⁵ So Mt. Vā *smṛtaḥ*; jMt *dhravaḥ*. Bh
tat-sutaḥ smṛtaḥ.

⁵⁶ So Mt genly, Vā. Vg, Bh agree. *Ce*Mt
Prasenajit; lMt °*sannaji*; Gr *Senajit*: lVg
omits him.

⁵⁷ *Kṛto*° in eMt; jMt *tato bhavyāt*.

⁵⁸ So all; but lVg *Kṣudrajit*: aVg omits
him.

⁵⁹ *Mararā* in eMt.

⁶⁰ In *ce*Mt *nrpaḥ*; nMt *na sah*.

⁶¹ So Mt genly: a'dVā *Kuliko*, Ca'a'a'Vā
Kṣul°; cMt *Kṣullako*, eMt *Kṣall*°; jMt
Tūlako. Vg *Kuṇḍaka*; fMt *Ku[va]nako*;

Sumitraḥ ⁶⁵ Surathasyāpi ⁶⁶ antyaś ca ⁶⁷ bhavitā nṛpaḥ
 eta Aikṣvākavaḥ ⁶⁸ proktā ⁶⁹ bhaviṣyā ye ⁷⁰ Kalau yuge ⁷¹
 Brhadbal-ānvaye jātā ⁷² bhaviṣyāḥ kula-vardhanāḥ ⁷³
 sūrās ca kṛta-vidyās ca satya-sandhā jit-ēndriyāḥ ⁷⁴
 niḥśeṣāḥ kathitās c-aiva nṛpā ye vai purātanāḥ ⁷⁵
 atr-ānuvaṁśa ⁷⁶-śloko 'yaṁ viprair gītaḥ purātanaiḥ ⁷⁷
 Ikṣvākūṇām ayaṁ vaṁśaḥ Sumitr-ānto bhaviṣyati ⁷⁸
 Sumitram prāpya rājānaṁ saṁsthām prāpsyati vai Kalau ⁷⁹.

ity evaṁ Mānavo vaṁśaḥ ⁸⁰
 prāg eva ⁸² samudāhṛtaḥ ⁸³

ity evaṁ Mānavam kṣatram ⁸¹
 Ailaṁ ca samudāhṛtam ⁸⁴

25

30

IVṣ Kurandaka: pBh Kanamika; fBh Ganaka; gBh Sun°; Bh genly Raṇ°; cBh Rūn°: cBh omit him. CGr Kudava; abGr Kudara. Gr inserts a king Sumitra before him, misplacing apptly the next king Suratha.

⁶² In jMt Kūl°; fMt Krul°; ceMt Kṣull°.

⁶³ So Mt, Vā. Vṣ, Bh agree: kBh Suretha; fMt Surasaḥ; hVṣ Adhiratha; IVṣ Viḍūr° or Vimyūr°: cBh Sunaya; cBh omit him. Gr apptly Sumitra, see note ⁶¹.

⁶⁴ Sutaḥ in cenMt. Bh tanayas tataḥ.

⁶⁵ So all: eVā omits this name.

⁶⁶ So Vā, bdfgjkMt; eMt °thaś c-āpi: other Mt °thāḥ jāto; AMt adds hy: eVā °thāt tasmāt: IVṣ says tat-putraś.

⁶⁷ So Vā, nMt; eVā °sa; Mt genly °tu; bVā antya ca. Antyaḥ crp to antaḥ in bMt, abGr; to anyah in CcefgjMt, Vṣ genly; to ataḥ in CGr; to tataś in dVā: so antyaś ca to anta-ya in gkVā. Bh niṣṭhānta.

⁶⁸ So bBhVā, Bd. A CMt ete c-Aik°; cenMt, eVā ete Ik°; bdfgMt ity ete-Ēk°, jMt °ev-Ēk°. Vā genly eta Aikṣvākavaḥ; mVā ete A[la]kṣvākavaḥ.

⁶⁹ Bhūpā in jMt.

⁷⁰ So Mt genly, eVā: cṛjnMt °ṣyanti. Vā, Bd bhavitāraḥ.

⁷¹ Kilau purā in jVā.

⁷² So Vā, Bd; eVā °tu ete; cenMt °ānvayā ye tu. Mt genly °ānvayā ye tu; jMt Vṛhad-ba... nṛpā ye tu; cḥjBh °balā nṛpāḥ. Vṣ °bal-ānvayāḥ. Bh genly ete Bārhadbal-ānvayāḥ: rBh ete c-ānāgatā nṛpāḥ.

⁷³ So Mt genly: dMt kṣudra-vaṁśh°, bfgMt

°bāndhavāḥ, eVā putra-bāndh°; kMt kṣatra-bandhavah: jMt krudha-vaṁdhanah; cenMt śuddha-vaṁśa-jāh. Bd reads this half line, mahā-vīrya-parākramāḥ. Vā repeats bhavitāraḥ Kalau yuge.

⁷⁴ This line is only in Vā and Bd.

⁷⁵ This line is only in cenMt.

⁷⁶ Atr-ānubandha in kMt.

⁷⁷ So Mt genly; bdfgjnMt gīto vipraiḥ. Vā bhaviṣya-jñair udāhṛtaḥ; Bd bhaviṣyaj-jñ°; dVā bhaviṣyatair (or °natr°): see Iutrodn. § 8.

⁷⁸ So all; but jMt Sumitrā te bh°: eMt omits the second half line.

⁷⁹ So all: except that Vṣ, Bh begin yatas tam; rBh ṣyati for prāpsyati; IVṣ tasmāt for saṁsthām. Vṣ reads the second half line, sa saṁsthām (h, saṁsthānam) prāpsyate Kalau. This line in jMt is—

Sumitraś c-āpi rājā vai saṁsthām prāpsyati kevalam.

⁸⁰ So this line is in Mt genly: bMt Mānavam vaṁśam.

⁸¹ So this line is in Vā, Bd; CgkVā †kṣetram: eVā blunders thus—

ity etat Soma-jaṁ kṣatram Aila-jaṁ samudāhṛtam;

for Aila-ja = Soma-ja, and neither term applies to the Aikṣvākus who were Mānavas.

⁸² In bMt Pāṇḍavam; cenMt Ailasya; eMt Elaś ca; kMt †malasa; jMt etaiḥ ca; dMt crp.

⁸³ In bMt °tam: eMt su-mah-ādṛtaḥ; cMt su-mah-ādḥbhuṭaḥ.

⁸⁴ Su-suhṛd-gatam in bVā.

Bārhadrathas.

Text—AMt 271, 17^b-30^a; AVā 99, 294-309^a; Bđ iii, 74, 107^b-122^a.

Corresp. passages—CVs iv, 23; GBh ix, 22, 45^b-49; CGr i, 141, 9-11.

The Matsya, Vāyu and Brahmanḍa give the whole, and agree except where noted. The Viṣṇu, Bhāgavata and Garuḍa give merely a list of names. There is some confusion in the Matsya in lines 20, 22, and 24 compared with l. 26, and its version and that of the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa are both given, the Matsya on the left and the other on the right.

Scarcely any copies are complete. L. 15 is only in Vā and Bđ, and ll. 30, 31 only in jMt. All copies of Mt omit ll. 26-28, except that l. 26 is in dfgkMt and ll. 27, 28 in cdefajkmMt. Other omissions are: cMt ll. 8, 9, 13, 20, 21, 23-25, and eMt also ll. 29, 32, 33; jMt ll. 8-12, 17-19, 32, 33; kMt ll. 12, 13, 17-23; lMt ll. 8-12, 21-29; mMt ll. 10-12, 14, 24, 25 and misplaces 18-20 after 23; nMt ll. 19 (second half)-22 (first half): a¹a²Vā ll. 23-25; bVā ll. 16 (second half)-18 (first half); cVā ll. 7-9, 15; fVā l. 25; gVā ll. 21-29; jVā ll. 1 (second half)-2 (first half), 10-12; lVā ll. 8-12; mVā ll. 23-25: hpMt and lVs have lost the whole. Vs and Bh omit Nirvṛti; rBh also Kṣema, Suvrata, Dharmanetra and Suśrama; and abGr Senājīti and all after Dr̥ghasena.

Lines 30, 31 in jMt are perhaps valuable. This dynasty was founded by Br̥hadratha, son of Vasu Caidyōparicara, and he and his 9 successors reigned down to the great battle; see JRAS, 1910, pp. 11, 22, 29. From the battle to Senājīti 6 kings are named, excluding Senājīti who is spoken of as the then reigning king; and from and including him to the end 16 kings are mentioned. There were thus 32 kings altogether, 10 before the battle and 22 after; or from the standpoint of Senājīti's reign 16 past and 16 future. Lines 30-31 in jMt take the standpoint of his reign and speak of him and his successors as the 16 future kings, and say *prima facie* their total duration was 723 years; see note ⁹⁸. Lines 32-33, which are not in jMt, reckon (in a way) from the beginning and speak of all the 32 kings as future since most of them were posterior to the battle; and thus they say the whole dynasty lasted 1000 years. These two statements are not contradictory but are hardly compatible, because taken together they assign 723 years to the last 16 kings and only 277 to the first 16. The total of 1000 years for 32 kings is excessive, and that of 723 years for 16 kings is absurd. But if we can read lines 30-31 as two independent sentences, and treat *tesām* as applying, not merely to those 16 future kings, but to the Br̥hadrathas generally, their purport stands thus—"These 16 kings are to be known as the future Br̥hadrathas: and¹ their kingdom (that is, the kingdom of the Br̥hadrathas) lasts 723 years." The total duration then, 723 years, would be within possibility, for the average reign would be about 22½ years. This rendering would of course discredit lines 32-33. If we read *vayo* in jMt with that construction (see note ⁹⁸), the total period would be 700 years and would give an average reign of just under 22 years, which would be *vinś-ādhikam*.

¹ The position of *ca* does not necessarily discredit this rendering, for *cas* are often inserted anywhere in these accounts.

Ata ūrdhvam pravakṣyāmi Māgadhā ye Br̥hadrathlāḥ ¹
 Jarāsandhasya ye vaṁśe ² Sahadev-ānvaye ³ nr̥pāḥ
 atītā vartamānās ca ⁴ bhaviṣyās ca tathā punaḥ ⁵
 prādhānyataḥ pravakṣyāmi gadato me nibodhata ⁶
 saṅgrāme Bhārata vṛtte ⁷ Sahadeve nipātite ⁸ 5
 Somādhis ⁹ tasya dāyādo ¹⁰ rājābhūt ¹¹ sa Girivraje ¹²
 pañcāśataṁ ¹³ tathāṣṭau ca ¹⁴ samā rājyam akārayat
 Śrutaśravās ¹⁵ catuḥ-ṣaṣṭiṁ ¹⁶ samās tasyānvaye ¹⁷ 'bhavat ¹⁸
 Ayutāyus ¹⁹ tu ²⁰ ṣaḍ-vimśad ²¹ rājyam varṣāny ²² akārayat
 catvāriṁśat ²³ samās tasya | samāḥ śataṁ ²⁴ Nirāmitro
 Nirāmitro ²⁵ divaṁ gataḥ | mahim bhuktvā divaṁ gataḥ 10

¹ So Mt, a²a³a⁴bdfghVā; also lVā (reading yo): fkmVā Māgadha (m, °dhe) ye Br̥hadrathāḥ, Bḍ Māgadho yo B°, jMt Māgadkhōso B°: other Vā Māgadheyaṁ Br̥hadrathāṁ: eVā vaṁśe ye vai V̥hadrathāt. Bh says—

Atha Māgadha-rājāno bhavitāro vadāmi te; which is not Skt but Pali; see Appendix I, § ii. Vṣ says—

Māgadhānām Vāhadrathānām bhaviṣyānām (kVṣ bhāvinām) anukramam kathayāmi.

² So Vā, Bḍ. Mt pūrveṇa ye Jarāsandhāt, which should prob. be pūrve tu ye J°, cf. jMt sarve ye tu J°. Vṣ says—

atra hi vaṁśe mahābalā Jarāsandha-pradhānāḥ bābhūvuh.

See JRAS, 1908, p. 316; and 1910, p. 29.

³ In jMt °devās tu ye; dMt crp.

⁴ Both accus. pl. in cefgmMt; both nom. sing. in jMt.

⁵ So Vā, Bḍ. Mt °ṣyāṁś (bdj, °ṣyās) ca nibodhata (j, nibodha tān).

⁶ This line only in Vā, Bḍ: eVā prādhānyas tān.

⁷ So Mt; jMt matte. Vā, Bḍ tasmin.

⁸ So Mt, eVā. Vā, Bḍ °devo nipātitaḥ: ceMt yaś ca bhuktā mahi drayam (c, drayam).

⁹ So Mt, Vā genly. Bḍ, cdefggVṣ, CGr Somāpi; eVā, bhVṣ °āri; bnMt °ādī; Vṣ genly °āmi; kVṣ °āri: aVṣ Semāvi; jMt, bVā Samādhi, hVā Sām°. Bh Mārjari. For Somādhis tasya cMt has Sahadevasya, eMt °devo 'sya.

¹⁰ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ tanayo.

¹¹ So Mt: eVā rāj-āsīt. Vā, Bḍ rājarsih.

¹² In lMt Giri[sam]rajan; ceMt samiti-dhvajah.

¹³ Pañcāśac ca in fgMt; jMt reads this

half line, pañcāśat sapta ca tathā.

¹⁴ Tathā c-aiva in bMt; eVā omits th-āṣṭau ca.

¹⁵ So Mt, a¹-⁴mVā, Bḍ. Bh, bkVṣ, CGr agree. CVā °śruvās; fBh °śruva; abGr °ścavās: gBh Śataśravas, tBh Vyutās°. Vṣ genly Śrutavān; aVṣ †Tukṣata.

¹⁶ So Mt, Ca¹Vā: a²-⁴bdfghjklmVā, Bḍ sapta-ṣaṣṭi; but dVā repeats the line thus—Śrutaśravā ṣaṣṭi samās tatas tasya suto 'bhavat:

so bVā also, crp.

¹⁷ So Mt genly; bMt °ānvayo; dMt °āntayo; nMt tasya nayo. Vā, Bḍ tasya suto.

¹⁸ Bharet in bkMt.

¹⁹ So Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ, Bh, CGr agree; gVṣ °tāyuta, abGr °tāmus, rBh °dhāyus; fBh °dhutās ca; jVṣ Uyyus. Mt genly Apratāpī; a¹a²dfgmMt Apratāpī (which would be an easy misreading of Ayutāyī); nMt Anayāpam; kMt Asutā.

²⁰ Ca in Mt.

²¹ So bkMt, Bḍ; Vā genly ṣaḍ-vimśam: mVā that or ṣaṭ-trimśam. Mt genly, a¹a²fgjmVā ṣaṭ-trimśat or °śam: but dfjMt, bdhVā ṣaḍ-trimśat or °śa, where the ḍ suggests the correct reading is ṣaḍ-vimśat, for v and tr are often confused.

²² So Vā, Bḍ. Mt samā (kMt abdam) rājyam.

²³ So Mt: kMt °śati.

²⁴ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā omits these words.

²⁵ So Mt genly; bnMt tasmān Nir°; nMt Nirāmitro: but ceMt samā Mitro bhuktvā c-aiva; kMt Sarnamitro bhogān bhuktvā; dfjMt Nirāmitro (g, °itro) bhuktvā c-ēmām.

• pañcāśatam samāḥ ṣaṭ ca²⁶ Sukṣatraḥ²⁷ prāptavān mahīm
trayo-vimśad Brhatkarmā²⁸ rājyaṁ varṣāny²⁹ akārayat

Senājit³⁰ samprayātas ca³¹

bhuktvā³³ pañcāśatam³⁴ mahīm

Senājit³⁰ sāmpratam³² cāpi

etā vai³⁵ bhokṣyate³⁶ samāḥ³⁷

Śrutañjaya³⁸ tu³⁹ varṣāni⁴⁰ catvāriṁśad⁴¹ bhaviṣyati

mahā-balo⁴² mahā-bāhur⁴³ mahā-buddhi⁴⁴-parākramaḥ

aṣṭā-vimśati⁴⁵ varṣāni mahīm⁴⁶ prāpsyati vai⁴⁷ Vibhuḥ⁴⁸

aṣṭa-pañcāśatam⁴⁹ cābdān⁵⁰ rājye sthāsyati vai Śuciḥ⁵¹

aṣṭā-vimśat⁵² samā rājā⁵³ Kṣemo⁵⁴ bhokṣyati vai mahīm⁵⁵

Vṣ, eVā, Bh, Gr *Nirāmitro*. Bh adds *tat-sutah*.

²⁶ But *fyMt ṣaḍva*; *nMt ṣaḍga*; *cMt ṣaṣṭaḥ*; *cMt hy aṣṭaḥ*; *eVā tasya*.

²⁷ So *dfMt, a²eVā, Bḍ*; Vṣ agrees: *kVā Sukṣatrā*; *a²fgmVā²ksattā*. *Ca¹a²Vā²kr̥ttaḥ*, *hVā²kr̥ttā*, *bVā²kr̥tā*, *dVā²ksakrt*; *gMt Kṣukṣatraḥ*; *bMt Sukṣaraḥ*. Mt genly *Suṣakṣaḥ*; *ceMt Sumitraḥ*; *kMt Nakṣatraḥ*; *nMt* erp. Bh, *bVṣ Sunakṣatra*; *abGr Suhakṣo*; *CGr Svakṣetra*. Vṣ adds *tat-tanayaḥ*.

²⁸ So Vā, Bḍ, with *śad*, *śam*, or *śa*. Mt *Brhatkarmā trayo-vimśad*; *ceMt tu dvā-trimśat*. Vṣ *Vrhatkarmān*. Bh *śsena*; *hBh Vihaśena*. *CGr Bahukarmaka*; *abGr Varukarmāna*.

²⁹ So Vā, Bḍ; *eVā varṣāni² kār^o*. Mt genly *abdan rājyaṁ*, *fyMt abdān^o*; *cenMt* read this half line, *prāptā (n, śas; c, tvā) cāmān rasundharām*.

³⁰ So Mt, Vā genly, Bḍ: *a²bdjMt, a²a²Vā*, Vṣ, *CGr Sena^o*; *nMt Śena^o*, *mMt Śyena^o*; *kVā San-jit*. Bh genly *Karmajit*, *nBh Kār^o*, *hBh Kār^o*; *rBh Dharmavid*; *eVā Maniś*. *CGr* inverts this king and the next. See the corresponding lines about Adhisimakṣṇa (p. 4, l. 6) and Divākara (p. 10, l. 5).

³¹ So Mt genly: *bfgmMt sāmpratāś cāyam*, *jMt samprajic^o*.

³² So Vā, Bḍ: *eVā sāmpratāś*.

³³ *Bhoktā* in *bdfgjlnMt*.

³⁴ So *a¹a²bdlMt*; *fyjMt śatā*. Mt genly *pañca-śatam*.

³⁵ So Vā genly, Bḍ. *CVā etān vai*, 'this (earth)'. But *eVā pañcāśad*, thus bringing this version into similarity to the corresponding verses, p. 4, l. 6 and p. 10, l. 5.

³⁶ *CVā bhujyate*; *fmVā bhokṣyase*.

³⁷ In *mVā tava*; *fvā tave*.

³⁸ So all; except *jMt Śrutiñj^o*; *a²kVā Śutañj^o*; *gMt Śrutiñj^o*; *bMt Stutañj^o*; *dVṣ Kṣutañj^o*; *bVṣ Ripuñj^o*; *eVā Śatamajñāś*. Bh names him *Srtañjaya* indirectly, *Srtañ-jayād Vipraḥ*; *cBh Mutāñj^o*. *CGr* inverts him and Senājit.

³⁹ *Ca* in *cenMt*.

⁴⁰ In *enMt varṣānām*; *jMt varṣān vai*.

⁴¹ *Pañca-trimśad* in *fyMt, eVā*.

⁴² This line is only in Vā, Bḍ. *CVā bāhur*. Bḍ *ripuñjaya*.

⁴³ *CVā² buddhir*.

⁴⁴ *CVā bhīma*; *gVā bala*.

⁴⁵ So Mt; *eVā aṣṭa-vimśat tu*; *gmVā pañca-vimśat tu*. Vā, Bḍ *pañca-trimśat tu*.

⁴⁶ *Masā* in *eVā*.

⁴⁷ So Mt genly; *jMt pāsyati^o*; *cenMt samprāpsyate*. Vā, Bḍ *pālayitā*.

⁴⁸ So Mt genly, *eVā*; *bMt vibho*; *cefyMt Prabhuḥ*; *lMt prabho*; *djkMt vīryavān* for *vai Vibhuḥ*. Vṣ, Bh genly *Vipra*; *pBh Dhīpra*; *jVṣ Pipra*; *kVṣ Ripu*; *bVṣ Ripuñ-jaya*. *CGr Bhūri*; *abGr Saṁvi*. Vā, Bḍ *nrpuḥ*, giving no name; *mVā [er]nrpuḥ*.

⁴⁹ *Aṣṭau pañcāśatā* in *eVā*.

⁵⁰ So *dfjMt, Vā, Bḍ*: *cMt cābdā*; *nMt, hVā cāṣṭān*; *eMt cāṣṭā*. Mt genly *ṣaṭ ca*: *eVā śūnho*.

⁵¹ So all: except *nBh Suci*; *bMt Muciḥ*; *eMt Śruciḥ*; *gBh Śūsi*. Vṣ adds *tasya putraḥ*.

⁵² In *cdeMt aṣṭā-trimśat* (or *śa*); *mMt dvātrimśas ca*.

⁵³ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *pūrnāḥ*.

⁵⁴ So all: except *eVā Kṣamo*; *lMt Kṣaimo*. Vṣ genly, *CGr Kṣemya*: *fyMt Pakso* or *Yakso*.

⁵⁵ So Mt genly; *cefyMt bhokṣyati* (*f, bhajyati*) *medinām*. Vā, Bḍ *rājā bhaviṣyati*.

Suvratas tu ⁵⁶ catuḥ-śaṣṭim ⁵⁷ rājyam prāpsyati vīryavān ⁵⁸	
pañca-trimśati ⁵⁹ varṣāni	pañca varṣāni pūrṇāni ⁶⁰
Sunetro ⁶¹ bhokṣyate mahīm ⁶²	Dharmanetro ⁶³ bhaviṣyati 20
bhokṣyate ⁶⁴ Nirvṛtiś ⁶⁵ c-êṃām ⁶⁶ aṣṭa-pañcāśataṃ samāḥ ⁶⁷	
aṣṭa-vimśat ⁶⁸ samā rājyam	aṣṭa-trimśat ⁶⁹ samā rājyam ⁷⁰
Trinetro ⁷¹ bhokṣyate tataḥ ⁷²	Suśramasya ⁷³ bhaviṣyati
catvāriṃśat tath-aṣṭau ca ⁷⁴ Drdhaseno ⁷⁵ bhaviṣyati	
trayas-trimśat tu ⁷⁶ varṣāni	trayas-trimśat tu varṣāni
Mahīnetraḥ ⁷⁷ prakāṣyate	Sumatiḥ ⁷⁹ prāpsyate tataḥ ⁸⁰
dvā-trimśat tu ⁸¹ samā rājā ⁸² Sucalas ⁸³ tu bhaviṣyati 25	

⁵⁶ So Bḍ. Vṣ, Bh, CGr agree; also eVā *Suvratas tha* (for *Suvrato 'tha*); CbfjkmVā *Suvalas tu*. Vā genly *Bhuvatas tu*; jVā, 2 MSS of CVā *Yuvatas*°; dVā *ṭsavatsara*; jBh *Suvṛta*; abGr *Sujāta*. Mt genly *Anuvratas*, gMt °*tras*; fMt *Anuvṛta*: ceMt *Kṣemakasya*.

⁵⁷ So Mt, Vā, Bḍ (°*ti*, °*ti*, °*ti*, °*ti*): cdeMt *sutah ṣaṣṭi*; dVā *tu ṣaṣṭim vai*; mMt *ṣaṣṭi samā*.

⁵⁸ In ceMt *yutnataḥ* (for *Suvrataḥ*? see note ⁶⁰).

⁵⁹ So CbMt; fjjkmMt °*trinśat tu* (n, ca; k omits tu). AlMt °*vimśati*; dMt *pañcāśac ca* (with a syll. short).

⁶⁰ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā *varṣāni* repeated.

⁶¹ In jMt *ṭSnānātro*; lMt *pañcāśan*.

⁶² *Mahān* in jMt.

⁶³ So Vā, Bḍ; also hVṣ, hkBh, and v. r. in GBh: hVā °*nepro*. Bh genly *Dharmasūtra*; nBh °*putra*; bḡBh °*kṣetra*. Vṣ, Gr briefly *Dharma*.

⁶⁴ *Bhojyate* in mMt, emVā.

⁶⁵ So Mt; jMt *Nirvṛtiś*; eVā *Nṛbhṛtaḥ*. Vā, Bḍ *nṛpatiś*.

⁶⁶ So Mt. Bḍ c-êṃā; a¹a²afkmVā *caimā*; hVā *caibhā*; dVā c-ôbhā; other Vā c-aiva: eVā *prthvin*.

⁶⁷ In fMt *aṣṭam p*°: bMt *aṣṭa-pañcāśa vai samām*.

⁶⁸ So Mt: cdeMt °*vinśa*.

⁶⁹ So Vā, Bḍ. CVā *aṣṭā*°.

⁷⁰ So Vā. Bḍ *rāṣṭraṃ*.

⁷¹ So Mt genly; jMt *Train*°: cdefgMt *Sun*°.

⁷² In ce/fjMt *nṛpaḥ*; dMt *mahīm*.

⁷³ So Bḍ; Vṣ genly *Suśrama*: kVṣ *Suśrama*, eVṣ and abGr *Suś*°, CGr *ṭSmaś*°:

dVṣ *Suśuma*; tBh *Śrama*. Bh genly *Śama*; hknḡBh *Sama*; bVṣ *Susava*; hVṣ *Suvrama*. Vā genly *Suvratasya*, eVā *Suśrut*°.

⁷⁴ So Mt; eVā °*sutam aṣṭau ca*. Vā, Bḍ °*sut ṭdas-aṣṭau ca*.

⁷⁵ So a²djMt, Vā genly, Bḍ. Vṣ genly, BcrtBh agree; CGr °*senaka*; jVṣ °*śneṣa*; abGr *Daihasenaka* (Pkt): mMt *Dṛḡhanetā*; fyMt and eVā *Vṛhatseno*; bMt *Mahats*°, nMt *Mahās*°, CVa¹a²a³Mt *Dyumat*°, and so GpBh (altered in p to *Drdhas*°).

⁷⁶ So Mt genly; djMt °*śac ca*; fyMt °*śati*: kMt *pañca-trimśad* (omitting tu).

⁷⁷ So CVa¹a²knMt: a¹a²bdfjMt *mahīm N*°.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly: a¹bfMt *praśāsyate*, dyMt °*ti*; a²kMt *praśasyate*, gṛMt °*ti*. The root *praśās* appears to be treated as belonging to the ya class, see *Various local dynasties*, note ⁵⁴, post.

⁷⁹ So Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh, CGr: dVṣ *Sumanti*.

⁸⁰ In eVā °*te mahīm*; dVā *vinśatiḥ samāḥ*.

⁸¹ So Mt genly, eVā; dfykMt °*śac ca*; nMt °*sutam*. Vā *dvā-vimśati*; jMt °*śat tu*. Bḍ *catvāriṃśat*.

⁸² So Mt; fyMt *rājan*. Vā, dMt *rājyam*. AkMt add *hy*.

⁸³ Mt genly *Acalas*; bMt *Abalas*: a¹a²jVā *Sucalo*; CVā *Sucālo*; a³a¹bhkVā *Sucālo*. Vṣ, nMt, Bh, CGr *Subalas*; hBh *Subāla*; eBh *Surbola*: eVā *Sudhanvā*; rBh *Bhūvana* or *Bhūbala*; one CVā MS *Yuvāno*. *Sucalo* seems the best form. Bḍ omits this line: dVā reads it—

rājyam Sucālo bhokṣyati atha śatru-jayī tataḥ;

which suggests a king *Śatrujayin*, but no other authority supports this. Bh adds *janitā tataḥ*, 'son of the preceding'.

catvāriṁśat samā rājā ⁸⁶ Sunetro ⁸⁶ bhokṣyate ⁸⁷ tataḥ ⁸⁸
 Satyajit ⁸⁹ prthivīm rājā ⁹⁰ try-aśītim ⁹¹ bhokṣyate ⁹² samāḥ ⁹³
 prāpy-ēmañ Viśvajic ⁹⁴ cāpi pañca-viṁśad ⁹⁵ bhaviṣyati
 Ripuñjayas ⁹⁶ tu varṣāṇi ⁹⁷ pañcāśat prāpsyate mahīm
 ṣoḍaśaite ⁹⁸ nṛpā jñeyā bhavitāro Bṛhadrathāḥ
 trayo ⁹⁹ viṁś-ādhikam teṣāṁ rājyañ ca śata-saptakam
 dvā-triṁśac ¹ ca ² nṛpā hy ete ³ bhavitāro Bṛhadrathāḥ ⁴
 pūrṇaṁ varṣa-sahasraṁ ⁵ vai ⁶ teṣāṁ rājyañ bhaviṣyati ⁷.

30

Pradyotas.

Text—AMt 272, 1-5; AVā 99, 309^b-314^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 122^b-127^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 1-2; GBh xii, 1, 2-4.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole dynasty. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata name all the kings.

• All are complete, except thus: CkMt omit lines 9, 10; gMt ll. 5, 6; lMt

⁸⁴ So Mt. Vā bhokṣyate tataḥ; eVā bhojyate°.

⁸⁵ As to this line, see p. 13: dfykMt rājyañ.

⁸⁶ So Mt, Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ genly, fṛtBh Sunīta, dVṣ °nāta; Bh genly, aVṣ °nātha. CGr Nīta.

⁸⁷ In kMt bhojyate; eVā bhavitā.

⁸⁸ In dfykMt nṛpā.

⁸⁹ So all (see p. 13); except jkMt Saptajit; cdemMt Sarvajit.

⁹⁰ So cdefkmMt, eVā; gjMt °vī-rājā. Vā genly °vī-rājyañ. Bḍ °vī-rāṣṭrañ.

⁹¹ So Vā, Bḍ: cefykMt aśītim; dMt aśītiḥ: eVā triṁśatam: jMt reads this half line, 'śītim prāpsyati vai samāḥ. Tryaśītim may be, a mistake for hy aśītim, or (by metathesis of vowels) for triṁśatam.

⁹² In eVā bhojyate; cdefykMt prāpsyate.

⁹³ In dfykMt tataḥ; ceMt nṛpā.

⁹⁴ So all (see p. 13): but kVā Vīśvajic; Vā genly Vīrajic: cdefykMt read this half line, Viśvajic cāiva (d, sarba) varṣāṇi.

⁹⁵ So ekMt, dfmVā, Bḍ. Vā genly, cdjmMt °triṁśad: gMt tri-pañcāśad, fMt °cād.

⁹⁶ So Mt, eVā. Vṣ, Bh agree: see Pradyotas, note ¹. Vā, Bḍ synonym. Ariñj°; dVā +Acirañj°; CGr Iṣuñj°: gMt omits this line and repeats l. 24 here. Vṣ adds tasya putrah.

⁹⁷ So Mt, Vā. Bḍ varṣāṇām.

⁹⁸ So jMt (see p. 13) with ṣoḍaśaite, which no doubt means ṣoḍaśaite, because from Senājit to the end there were 16 kings, though its list is imperfect.

⁹⁹ So jMt (see p. 13) reading vayo, which is no doubt a misreading of trayo, tr and v being often confused. If we keep vayo, the line may perhaps mean, 'Their periods exceeded 20 years, and their kingdom lasted 700 years'; yet the first of these two statements, if it can be so rendered, seems inept: see p. 13.

¹ So Mt genly, Vā. CblMt °śati (omitting ca). Bḍ dvātriṁśac, which is the total number of kings mentioned. This half line in gVā is, ete mahābalāḥ sarve.

² Mat tu; eVā omits.

³ CMt nṛpārhyate (misprint): eVā ete hi nṛpā.

⁴ So Mt, Bḍ. Vā genly °thāt. CVā Dṛhadrathāḥ; eVā dṛdha-vratāḥ.

⁵ In dMt pūrvañ v°; fjMt pūrve varṣa-sahasre. Vṣ varṣa-sahasraṁ ekam. Bh sāhasra-vatsaram.

⁶ Mt tu.

⁷ After this line AbcMt insert l. 3 from the next dynasty.

inserts l. 2 of the next dynasty after l. 8: *eVā* omits ll. 9 (second half), 10; *mVā* omits ll. 5, 6 and reads then ll. 8, 9, 7-10: *nBh* has lost *Viśākhayūpa* to the end; and *hpMt* and *lBh* the whole.

The total of the reigns agrees with the period assigned to the dynasty, which is 138 years according to *Vā*, *Bd*, *Vs*, and *Bh*. *Mt* generally says the duration was 52 years, or at most (if *devi-pañcāśat* could mean *devi pañcāśat*) 100 roundly; but several copies make it 152 years (see note ³⁹).

Brhadrathesv ¹ atīteṣu ² Vītihotreṣv ³ Avantīṣu ⁴	
Pulikah ⁵ svāminam hatvā ⁶	Sunikah ⁷ svāminam hatvā
sva [*] -putram abhiṣekṣyati	putram samabhiṣekṣyati ⁹
miṣatām ¹⁰ kṣatriyāṇām ¹¹ ca ¹²	miṣatām kṣatriyāṇām hi ¹³
Bālakah ¹⁴ Pulik-ōdbhavaḥ ¹⁵	Pradyotam ¹⁶ Suniko ¹⁷ balāt ¹⁸
sa vai praṇata ¹⁹ -sāmanto ²⁰ bhaviṣyo ²¹ naya-varjitaḥ ²²	

¹ In *a¹bMt* *°rathe*: *nMt* *Bārhadratheṣv*, *eMt* *°ratheṣa*.

² In *beMt* *vyatīteṣu*; *a¹Mt* *°te tu*; *bVā* omits *°tīteṣu*.

³ So *Mt* genly: *Vā* genly and *cdenMt* *Vita^o*; *eVā* *Rūti^o*. *Bd* *Vīrahantṛṣv*. *Vīti-hotreṣv* is right; see *Early Contemporary Dynasties*, l. 7, where all three read it right; the name occurs often in the *Purāṇas*.

⁴ So *Mt* genly. *Bd*, *a²a³bfgH* *Vā* *a-vartīṣu*. Other *Vā* *°hotreṣu* *vartīṣu*, *eVā* *°varṇīṣu*, *fjgkMt* *°bandhūṣu*; *lMt* *°bhaviṣyati*.

⁵ So *a¹⁻³bcdefgkmnMt*. *CGVa¹Mt* *Pulakah*; *jMt* *Palikāh*.

⁶ *Kṛtvā* in *eMt*.

⁷ So *fmVā*; and *Vs* genly. *Bd*, *Bh* *Śunaka*; *dBh* *Śunaka*. *Vā* genly, *hkVs* *Munikaḥ*; *lVs* *Munika*. *Vs* says—

yo 'yam Ripuñjayo nāma Bārhadratho 'ntyah tasya Suniko nām-āmātyo^{*} bhaviṣyati. Sa c-ainam svāminam hatvā sva-putram Pradyota[†]-nāmānam abhiṣekṣyati: where ^{*}*kVs* *āpatyo*; [†]*eVs* *Pradyotana*. *Bh* reads—

yo 'ntyo^{*} Purañjayo[†] nāma bhaviṣyo Bārhadrathah[†]
tasy-āmātyas tu Śunako hatvā svāmi-
nam ātmajam

Pradyota-sañjñam rājānam kartā:—

where ^{*}*lVs* *'nyah*; [†]*dBh* *Ripuñjayo* correctly, see p. 17, note ⁹¹: *°Bārhadrathah* for the metre; *eBh* *Bārhayad^o*; *cpBh* *Vārhad^o*; *dBh* *°tha Bārha^o*; *afnsBh* *Bārhad^o*, in dis-

regard of metre: *qBh* and v. r. in *GBh* amend this half line, *bhāryo Bārhadratho nṛpaḥ*.

⁸ *Swam* in *bedMt*; *eMt* *†sūm*.

⁹ So *Vā*, *Bd*; *sam-* was probably *swam* originally: *dVā* *rājye 'bhi^o*.

¹⁰ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* *jīyatām*; *lMt* *nīyatām*; *nMt* *nīyantā*; *dMt* *†maṣilām*: see p. 17, note ⁷.

¹¹ In *dMt* *°jāyān*.

¹² *Tu* in *cdefgjnMt*.

¹³ *Ca* in *eVā*.

¹⁴ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* *bālakah*; *jMt* *Mālikah*; see note ²⁷.

¹⁵ So *cejnMt*; see note ⁸. *ACMt* *Pulak^o*; *kMt* *Pulako* merely. But *bdMt* *Puliko balāt*, *lMt* *Pulako^o*, *fgmMt* *Pāluko^o*. The accus. seems to be required.

¹⁶ So *Vā* genly. *Vs*, *Bh* corroborate, see note ⁷. *Bd^otim*; *eVā* *Sudyotam*. *Ca¹a³kVā* *Pradyoto*.

¹⁷ See note ⁷; *fVā* *Śunike*. *Vā* genly *Muniko*, *mVā* *°ke*. *Bd* *nṛpatim*.

¹⁸ To its statement in note ⁷ *hVs* adds *†kyi* *saṁmati pārśva śvayam eva rājā śvayāmava bhāvino*.

¹⁹ In *eMt* *prajāta*; *kMt* *prajāntāḥ*.

²⁰ In *lMt* *śrīmantō*.

²¹ So *Mt* genly, *eVā*. *Vā* genly, *a¹a²bdMt* *°sye*; *jMt* *bhavitā*.

²² So *Ca²a²cejklmMt*, *cfighklmVā*; so *AVā* which prints it *'naya^o*. But *dMt* *nava-v^o*; *eVā* *na ca v^o*; *fMt* *na ca dhārmikah*, *GVa²a²mMt* *°dharmataḥ*, *bMt* *°dharma-jit*:

trayo-vimśat samā rājā ²³ bhavitā ²⁴ sa nar-ōttamah ²⁵
catur-vimśat samā rājā ²⁶ Pālako ²⁷ bhavitā tatah ²⁸

Viśākhayūpo ²⁹ bhavitā nrpaḥ pañcāśatīm ³⁰ samāḥ
eka-vimśat samā rājā ³¹ | eka-vimśat ³² samā rājyam
Sūryakas ³³ tu bhaviṣyati Ajakasya ³⁴ bhaviṣyati
bhaviṣyati ³⁵ samā ³⁶ vimśat ³⁷ tat-suto Nandivardhanah ³⁸
dvi-pañcāśat tato ³⁹ bhuktvā ⁴⁰ | aṣṭa-trimśac ⁴¹-chatam ⁴² bhāvyāḥ ⁴³
pranaṣṭāḥ ⁴⁴ pañca te nrpāḥ. Prādyotāḥ ⁴⁵ pañca te sutāḥ ⁴⁶. 10

dVā mitra-varjitaḥ; bVā merely varjitaḥ.
Bd reads this half line *bhaviṣyena pravartitaḥ*.

²³ In *a²a⁴Vā rājya*.

²⁴ In *nMt bhaviṣyat*.

²⁵ In *blnMt manmath-āturaḥ*.

²⁶ So Vā, Bd. Mt genly *aṣṭa-vimśati var-
ṣāni*: *bMt °vimśati tathā varṣā* (with an
extra syll.), see Appendix I, § i: *kMt
°vimśat tato yo* (with a syll. short).

²⁷ So all, except *kBh Pāl°*; *dBh Yāl°* (*p*
and *y* confused); *kVṣ Gopāl°*; *ceMt Bāl°*;
bnMt Tūl°; *jMt Pāsako*; *lVṣ Baka*; *lMt
Nalako*. *Vṣ* adds, *tasy-āpi Pālaka-nūmā
putro*; *Bh yat Pālakaḥ sutāḥ*.

²⁸ So Vā, Bd: *eVā punaḥ*. Mt *nrpaḥ*.

²⁹ So genly, except *dVṣ °yapa*, *bVṣ °yūgha*,
cBh °sūpa, *bMt* and *aVṣ °bhūpo*, *fnVā °dhūpo*,
jBh °dūya, *fjMt °rūpo*, *rBh °nrpa*. With
the dialectical variation of *ṣ* and *kh*, *nMt*
and *deVā Viśaṣa-yūpo*, *bhVā °sūyo*, *kBh
°mūpa*. Otherwise *dMt Viśvākhayūpo*; *hBh
Visay°*; *kVṣ Viśāsvamī°*. *Bh* adds *tat-
putro*; *Vṣ* implies it.

³⁰ So *Ca¹a²a⁴Vā*; *bghkVā °tī*; *a³IVā °tīḥ*;
Bd *°tam*. Mt reads this half line, *tri-
pañcāśat* (*jMt pañcāśa dvā*) *tathā samāḥ*;
eVā kṣatriyānām samā satam.

³¹ So Mt: *kMt rājya*.

³² So *efVā*, Bd: *mVā* first *trayo-vimśat*
(part of l. 5?) but in repeating has *eka°*.
Vā genly *eka-trimśat*.

³³ So Mt genly: *lMt Sūryabas*; *dMt Mūr-
jakaḥ*; *mMt Mrjakaḥ*.

³⁴ So Vā, Bd; *fVā Ajyak°*, *dVā Akark°*;
eVā reads this half line *Ajakaḥ sa kariṣyati*.
Bh genly *Rājaka*; *Vṣ Janaka*; *dBh Cājaka*;
akVṣ Ajaka; *hVṣ Aja*.

³⁵ In *bMt Śiśunākah*.

³⁶ So Vā, Bd, *bMt*. Mt genly *nrpas*;
fMt bhr̥sas.

³⁷ Mt *trimśat*; *jMt tadcat*.

³⁸ So Mt, Bd. *Vṣ*, *Bh* agree: *dBh Nanda°*
altered to *Nandī°*; *eVṣ Nakṣi°*. Vā genly
Varṭi°; one MS of *CVā Vardhi°*; *a¹Vā
Kṛti°*. *Bh* adds *tat-putraḥ*; *Vṣ* implies it.

³⁹ So *ACbklmMt*: *dMt chate*; *fjpnMt chu-
tam*; *ceMt satam*.

⁴⁰ In *cdefjMt bhūtvā*; *lMt bhāryah*.

⁴¹ So Vā genly, Bd; *Ca¹Vā aṣṭā°*; *jVā aṣṭi-
trimśat*; *dVā tṣaṣṭāṣa*.

⁴² In *jmVā satam*; *dhVā tatam*; *gVā samā*.

⁴³ In *gVā rājā*.

⁴⁴ In *gMt prānaṣṭāḥ*; *bMt prānanyāḥ*;
fMt prānāṇḍyāḥ; *lMt prothotāḥ*.

⁴⁵ So Vā genly, Bd: *a¹a²a⁴kmVā*, *Vṣ Prad°*.
Bh Pradyotanāḥ; *dBh Prād°*.

⁴⁶ So Vā. Bd *nrpāḥ*. Similarly *Vṣ*—
ity etc *aṣṭa*-trimśad*-uttaram abda*-
satam pañca Pradyotāḥ pṛthivīm bhok-
ṣyanti*:

where * *aVṣ ṣaṭ*, *hVṣ dvā*; * *bhkVṣ vimśad*;
* *jVṣ arḍha*, *hVṣ aṣṭa*, and *kVṣ arū*, all cor-
ruptions of *abda*. *Bh* says—

pañca Pradyotanā ime
aṣṭa*-trimś*-ōttara-satam bhokṣyanti
pṛthivīm nrpāḥ:

where * *fnlBh aṣṭā*; * *mBh vimś*.

Śisunāgas.

Text—AMt 272, 6–13^a; AVā 99, 314^b–322^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 127^b–135^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 3; GBh xii, 1, 5–8^a.

The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole, and the Matsya all except lines 11, 12. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata name all the kings and state the duration of the dynasty. All copies of the Matsya erroneously introduce the first two Kāṇvāyana kings (see note ²⁴) after l. 7; and the Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa put l. 8 before ll. 6 and 7 contrary to all the other authorities.

The defects are these. CMt omits l. 1; ceMt ll. 13, 14; jMt ll. 6 (second half), 7 (first half); kMt ll. 2, 3, 10; lMt ll. 5, 6; a⁴Vā omits ll. 6–end; eVā ll. 8–10; fVā ll. 15, 16, 17 (first half); gVā ll. 7–14, 16, 17; hVā has only ll. 1–3; mBh omits Kṣemadharman to Udayin; nBh has only the verses stating the duration of the dynasty; and hpMt, bBh have nothing.

All the authorities say there were 10 kings, and do not differ much in their names. The duration of the dynasty appears to have been 163 years, for the Mt reading in l. 16 can well mean ‘hundred, three, plus sixty’ (see Introdn. §§ 42 ff.), though it would mean ‘360’ if taken as literary Sanskrit; moreover ‘163’ is a probable figure while ‘360’ is an impossible one. The terms certainly admit of ambiguity, and an examination of the other versions shows how it developed.

The Bḍ and Bh reading *śaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayaṃ* (see note ⁴⁰) can also mean 163, if it represents a Pkt original of (something like) *saṣṭhy-uttara-sataim tao*, but means 360 if taken as correct Skt. The former interpretation seems preferable, because this expression is used with *varṣāṇi* in Bḍ and with *samāḥ* in Bh, and these combinations do not constitute correct Skt but would be good in Pkt: still an ambiguity does appear there. It seems to have affected the two other versions. The Vā reading (see note ⁴⁶) taken as Pkt means ‘hundred, three, plus sixty-two’, but this is an impossible style of reckoning, and the only tenable construction is to read it as correct Skt meaning 362. As this is an impossible figure, I would suggest that the *dvi* is a corruption of *abda*¹, that the initial *a* blended with or was elided after the word that represented *varṣāṇi* in the Pkt original², and that the remaining *bda* was mistaken for *dvā* (or *dvi*). If this suggestion be tenable, the Vā reading agreed with Mt and meant 163. The Vṣ following upon the ambiguity and mistake says explicitly ‘362 years’ in correct Skt.

¹ Compound consonants are sometimes inverted in the MSS, see note ⁴³.

² Such elisions do take place in Pkt, and appear in Sanskrit, cf. p. 15, note ²⁹; p. 17, note ²¹; *Various local dynasties*, note ⁴⁸, *infra*; and to that cause are no doubt due the elisions in the middle of the following lines, AVā 88, 81, 115; 94, 21:—

apadhvaṃs-ēti bahuśo ’vadat krodha-samanvitah.

devaiḥ sārḍham mahātejā ’nugrahāt tasya dhīmataḥ.

rathī rājā ’py anucaro ’nyo ’gāc c-aiv-ānudrśyate.

Instances might be easily multiplied from the Purāṇas.

Hatvā¹ teṣāṃ yaśaḥ kṛtsnam Śisunāgo² bhaviṣyati
Vārāṇasyāṃ sutam sthāpya³ Vārāṇasyāṃ sutas tasya⁴
śrayiṣyati⁵ Girivrajam sa yāsyati⁶ Girivrajam⁷
Śisunāgas ca⁸ varṣāṇi catvāriṃśad bhaviṣyati
Kākavarṇaḥ⁹ sutas tasya¹⁰ ṣaṭ-trimśat¹¹ prāpsyate mahīm¹²
ṣaṭ-trimśac cāiva¹³ varṣāṇi tatas tu viṃśatiṃ¹⁴ rājā
Kṣemadharmā¹⁵ bhaviṣyati Kṣemadharmā¹⁶ bhaviṣyati
catvāriṃśat¹⁷ samā rājyaṃ¹⁸ Kṣatraujāḥ¹⁹ prāpsyate tataḥ²⁰
aṣṭā-vimśati²¹ varṣāṇi²² Vimbiśāro²³ bhaviṣyati²⁴
Ajātaśatruṛ²⁵ bhavitā pañca²⁶-vimśat samā nrpaḥ
pañca²⁷-vimśat²⁸ samā rājā Darśakas²⁹ tu bhaviṣyati

¹ In a³Vā *hṛtvā*; kVā *hate*; cMt *kṛtvā*.

² So mMt, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree: nMt *Śisunāgo* here. Mt, Vā genly *Śisunāko*; bMt *Śigru*^o; cMt *Suśrūvāko* here; kVā *Śiśuko*; kVṣ *Śisunāma*.

³ So Mt: jMt *°sthāpyo*; dfMt *tu samisthāpya*.

⁴ So Vā and Bd.

⁵ So Mt genly; so bMt *ante*, see p. 18, but *śrayiṣyati* here: cenMt *vrajiṣyati*; dfjgmMt *adhyāsyati*, jMt *°dhiṣṭhās*^o; lMt *°arayaneti*.

⁶ So a²a³dVā, 3 MSS of CVā; bfjglmVā so y^o: hVā *yo y^o*; kVā [so *yosya*] *yo y^o*. Bd *saṃy^o*: a¹Vā, 3 MSS of CVā *samprāpsyati*.

⁷ In kVā *°vratam*.

⁸ So Bd. Vā *Śisunākasya* for *°nākaś ca*, as in fMt. Mt genly *Śisunākas tu*; egMt *Śisru*^o (g, ca); bMt *Śigru*^o.

⁹ So Mt, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree; lMt *Kāker*^o: kMt and fBh *Kākakarnaḥ*; mMt *Kāṣṇi-varmaḥ*. Vā *Śakavarṇaḥ*; fVā *Śavarna*.

¹⁰ Vṣ, Bh corroborate.

¹¹ So Vā, bdfjgmMt, Bd: cMt *ṣaṭ-trimśat*, which suggests *ṣaṭ-vimśat*, as in Mt genly: nMt *ṣaṭ-gimśat* (= *ṣaṭ-vimśat*).

¹² So Mt, eVā (which has only these two words). Vā, Bd *ca bhaviṣyati*.

¹³ So Mt genly (jMt *°cāpi*): bceMt *°sati ca* (b omits *ca*); nMt *ṣaṭvimśati* (= *ṣaṭ-trimśati*) *ca*.

¹⁴ So Vā and Bd.

¹⁵ So Mt genly. CMt *°dhomā*; nMt *°dhanvā*; dMt *°ṣyemadharmā*, where ṣ is dialectic variation in writing of kh which = kṣ: bMt + *Lemacarmā*.

¹⁶ So eVā, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree. Vā genly

°varmā; bVā *°rama*; lVā *°cam*: *dehpsBh °dharmā*, and yet say the next king was *Kṣetradharma-ja*; similarly fBh *Kṣemadhanvā* and *°dharma-ja*. Vṣ adds *tat-putraḥ*; Bh *tasya sutaḥ*.

¹⁷ So Vā, cenMt, Bd. Mt genly *caturvimśat*, dMt *°sati*.

¹⁸ So Vā, bMt. Bd *rāṣṭram*; cMt *rājā*. Mt genly *so 'pi*.

¹⁹ So Vā genly, Bd. Vṣ genly agrees; bdfjgmVā *°trojāḥ*: eVā *Kṣetrojā*, mVā *°jah*, kVā *°yah*. Bh *Kṣetrajāna*; kBh *°trata*; qBh *Kṣetra*. Mt mostly *Kṣemajit*; gMt *°mavit*; fMt *°māmit*; dMt *°mābhi*; kMt *°māvi*; ceMt *°mārciḥ*; nMt *Hemajit*. Bh adds *Kṣemadhurma-ja*; Vṣ implies it.

²⁰ So Vā, Bd. Mt *mahīm*; nMt *mahī*.

²¹ So Mt. Vā *°sat* (bVā *°śe*). Bd *aṣṭa-trimśat*.

²² So Mt. Vā, Bd *samā rājā*, eVā *°nrpaḥ*.

²³ There is great variation in this name: aVṣ *Vinvisāra*; jVṣ *Vimis*^o. Vṣ genly *Vidmis*^o. Bd, Bh, hVṣ *Vidhis*^o. Vā, kVṣ *Vivis*^o; bVṣ *Surindus*^o; mMt *Vidusāno*; jMt *Vindumāno*, bfjgmMt *°duseno*; dMt *Bindumāno*. Mt genly *Vindhyaseno*, nMt *Vidh*^o: kMt *Kṣemadharmā*. Vṣ adds *tat-putro*.

²⁴ After this line Mt inserts the two lines about Kāṇvāyana and Bhūmimitra of the Kāṇvāyana dynasty (see *infra*), and repeats them in their proper place there. It is a clear error of misplacement.

²⁵ So all: nMt *Ajātās*^o; kVā *Ajus*^o. Bh adds *sutas tasya*.

²⁶ So Vā, Bd. Mt genly *sapta*; cenMt *saptā*; bIMt *aṣṭā*.

²⁷ So Vā, Bd. Mt *catur*.

Udayi³⁰ bhavitā tasmāt³¹ trayas-trimśat samā nrpāḥ
 sa vai pura-varaṁ rājā prthivyāṁ Kusum-āhvayam³²
 Gaṅgāyā dakṣiṇe kule³³ caturthe 'bde³⁴ kariṣyati
 catvāriṁśat³⁵ samā³⁶ bhāvyo rājā³⁷ vai Nandivardhanah³⁸
 catvāriṁśat trayas³⁹ cāiva Mahānandī⁴⁰ bhaviṣyati
 ity ete bhavitāro⁴¹ vai⁴² Śaisunāgā nrpā daśa⁴³
 śatāni⁴⁴ trīṇi varṣāṇi⁴⁵ ṣaṣṭi-varṣ-ādhiḥ kāni tu⁴⁶
 Śisunāgā⁴⁷ bhaviṣyanti⁴⁸ rājānaḥ kṣatra-bandhavaḥ⁴⁹.

²⁸ Bḍ, a¹Vā trimśat.

²⁹ Mt genly *Vaṁśukas*; eMt *Vaṁs*^o; cMt *Vas*^o; nMt *Vis*^o; jMt *Vaṣyagas*; kMt *Śakas* cāiva (omitting *tu*). Vā *Darśakas*. Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh *Darbhaka*; fBh *Dambh*^o. *Darbhaka* seems the most central form.

³⁰ There is great variation in this name. Mt genly *Udāsi*; nMt *Udātir*; lMt *Udam-bhī*; dfMt *Udāmbhī*, gMt *Udhīr*; bMt *Udābhīr*. Ca²Vā *Udayi*; a²lVā, Bḍ *Udayi*, bVā *Yam*; kVā *Tṛaduyi* (an easy misreading); jMt *Tedāmnī*; mVā *Uda*. Vṣ genly *Udayāśva*, acfjKvṣ *Yana*, lVṣ *Ya*; bVṣ *Anaya* (or *Dan*); hVṣ *Oraya*. Bh *Ajaya* or *Ājaya*, (but see note³⁸). *Udayi* seems the best form.

³¹ In a¹⁻³Vā *yasmāt*; bMt *tasyās*; jMt *bhūpās*.

³² This line and the next only in Vā, Bḍ.

³³ In a²bVā *kone*; kVā *ko[r]a[n]e*.

³⁴ So Vā. Bḍ *hni*: eVā *caturatpram* (for *catur-abdām*?).

³⁵ So Mt, a²lVā, Bḍ. Vā genly *drā-catvāriṁśat*, with a syll. too much (*drā* cancelled in dVā): eVā *dvi-c*^o.

³⁶ In eVā *satir*.

³⁷ *Rājā* wanting in eVā.

³⁸ So all: kVā *Rand*^o; nMt *Nandivardanaḥ*. Bh gives him the patronymic *Ajaya*; qBh *Ājñeya*: see note³⁰.

³⁹ CVā *trayam* (which AVā adopts); jMt *bhayan*; nMt *tataḥ*.

⁴⁰ So Mt, Vā genly. Vṣ agrees: Bh *diḥ*; lJMt, kVā *dā*; nMt *Mahānandī*; fVā *Mahānandī*. Bḍ *Sahānandīr*. Bh adds *śatas tataḥ*.

⁴¹ In eVā *saṁkhyayā bhavitārā*.

⁴² In a¹⁻⁴Mt *tra*.

⁴³ So Vā, except that it gives the name as *Śaisunākā*; mVā *Śaiṣu*^o; gVā *Śaisukāś ca*: see note⁴⁷. The correct number of kings is ten, as Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh say (see notes⁴⁶

and⁴⁸). Mt is confused. Its original reading was probably *daśa vai Śisunāka-jāḥ*, but, since the first two Kāṇvāyana kings were erroneously inserted (see note²⁴), the number of names in it became 12, and attempts were made to reconcile the discrepancy: hence CGVcdjfmMt boldly read *daśa dvau* (fy, b²au) *Śisunāka-jāḥ*, eMt *daśādvā Śisū*^o, kMt [*daśa*] *drādaśa Śisū*^o; jMt crp [*vai*] *daśa dve Śisranekatāḥ*: other copies evade inconsistency by an indefinite statement, thus a¹⁻⁴b¹nMt *varṣe vai* (n, 'smīn) *Śisunākatāḥ* (j, *jāḥ*; l, *Śisrunākatāḥ*); and eVā, which often agrees with Mt, *Śisunāg-ādayo nrpāḥ*. For Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh, see note⁴⁶.

⁴⁴ In bVā *etāni*.

⁴⁵ In eVā *varṣāṇāḥ* (for *ṇām*). Mt genly *pūrnāni*; dMt *pūrbāni*: fMt omits this word.

⁴⁶ So Mt; cenMt *ca* for *tu*: bMt *ṣaṣṭir vā adhiḥ kāni ca*; jMt *ṣaṣṭi varṣāṇi kāni ca*. Vā genly *dvi-ṣaṣṭy-abhyadhiḥ kāni tu*; a¹⁻³b¹dmVā *dvā*^o; lVā *dvā-ṣaṣṭy-ābh*^o; eVā *dvi-ṣaṣṭyas c-ādhiḥ*^o. Bḍ condenses this and the preceding line into one—

bhaviṣyanti ca varṣāṇi ṣaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayam.

Bh agrees, condensing the same two lines and the next into two lines—

Śisunāgā * daśa-aiv-aite ṣaṣṭy-uttara-śata-trayam¹

samā bhokṣyanti prthivīm, Kuru-śreṣṭha, Kalau nrpāḥ;

where * *adr* lBh *Śaiś*^o; * *h* Bh *trayaḥ*. Vṣ agrees with Vā—

ity ete Śaisunāgā¹ daśa bhūmi-pālās trīṇi varṣa-śatāni dvi¹-ṣaṣṭy-adhiḥ kāni bhaviṣyanti;

where ¹ CVṣ *Saus*^o; ¹ kVṣ crp *trīṇi varṣa-sahasrāṇi śatāni dve*. See discussion, p. 20.

⁴⁷ So Bḍ, eVā. Mt genly *Śisunākā*; eMt

Early Contemporary Dynasties.

Text—AMt 272, 13^b–17 ; AVā 99, 322^b–325 ; Bḍ iii, 74, 135^b–138.

Corresp. passages—Vṣ and Bh, *nil*.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa give the whole of this passage, except that the latter two have not got l. 8 and remove l. 2 to l. 8 : jMt omits ll. 1, 5, 6 ; a²Vā ll. 2, 6, 7 ; mVā ll. 6–8 (first half) ; and h₁Mt and a⁴hVā have nothing. Here eVā gives ll. 1, 3, 4, 6 only, but long afterwards, out of place, namely after the first line about Viśvasphaṇi, inserts ll. 6, 7, 5, and 2 in modified form.

Etaiḥ sārḍham means contemporary with the Bārhadrathas and their successors, the Pradyotas and Śiśunāgas, for none of these are mentioned here, but the Aikṣvākus and the Kurus (who are probably the Pauravas) are included, whose dynasties have been fully set out *ante*. The next king Mahāpadma Nanda is called ‘destroyer of all the kṣatriyas’, and ‘monarch of the whole earth which was under his sole sway’—which terms imply that he overthrew all the kingdoms mentioned in this list, so that all subsequent dynasties except the Kāṇvāyanas were śūdras (see *Nandas*, ll. 2–6). This list of contemporary dynasties means therefore all the old kṣatriya dynasties, which reigned from the time of the great battle till they and the Śiśunāgas in Magadha were swept away by the Nandas, whose dynasty follows this list.

Etaiḥ¹ sārḍham bhaviṣyanti tāvāt²-kālaṁ³ nrpāḥ pare⁴
tulya-kālaṁ bhaviṣyanti sarve hy ete⁵ mahikṣitāḥ
Aikṣvākavaś catur-vimśat⁶ Pañcālāḥ⁷ sapta⁸-vimśatiḥ
Kāśeyās⁹ tu catur-vimśad¹⁰ aṣṭā-vimśatir¹¹ Haihayāḥ¹²

Śiśru°. Vā, kMt Śaiśu° ; eMt Śausu° : bMt Śiśunākād.

¹⁸ So Mt, Vā. Bḍ *daś-aiv-aite*.

¹⁹ So Mt, Bḍ ; fVā °vāḥ. Vā, dMt °bāndhavāḥ ; fMt vandhanāḥ ; bMt °vīcavaḥ with marg. note °bandhavaḥ. CVā confuses this with the first line of the following dynasties, reading—

Śaiśunākā bhaviṣyanti Tāvāt-kālaṁ nrpāḥ
pare

rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavāḥ¹ etaiḥ sārḍham
bhaviṣyati :

and so jMt which has the first line only, reading *yāvat-k°*. Hence perhaps the words *rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavaḥ* should be read with the following list.

¹ See above, note ¹⁹ : kVā *ete*.

² So Vā, Bḍ. Mt *yāvat* ; bMt *yāna* (with marg. note *yāvat*).

³ So Vā, Bḍ, f₁Mt : dMt *kālī* ; Mt genly *Kālī* ; eMt *kila* ; bMt *eka* (with marg. note *Kālī*).

⁴ *Cu te* in gVā. For this half line kVā have *rājānaḥ kṣatra-bāndhavāḥ* (see above, note ¹⁹), and kVā then adds as in the text.

⁵ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *surva eva*.

⁶ So bf₁mVā, Bḍ. Vā genly *Aikṣvākavaś* (dVā °vaś) ; eVā *Iksvākavaś*. Mt genly *catur-vimśat* (ceMt °vimśas, b₁Mt °vimśa) *tath-Aikṣvākāḥ* ; bedf₁jMt °Ēkṣvākāḥ ; jMt °mah-Ēkṣvākāḥ ; and so nMt *erp*. This number does not agree with the Aikṣvāku list, see p. 9.

⁷ So bedf₁j₁nMt, a¹⁻²bedf₁mVā, Bḍ : other Mt and Vā *Pāñc°*.

⁸ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *pañca* (perhaps by influence of *Pañcālāḥ*).

⁹ So Mt genly : cekMt *Kāśeyās* ; lMt, eVā *Kāśayās* ; bMt *Kāśasās* ; d₁Mt *Kāleyās*. Vā genly, Bḍ *Kālakās*. See Appendix II, § ii.

Kalīṅgās¹³ cāiva dvā-triṃśad¹⁴ Āsmakāḥ pañca-vimśatiḥ¹⁵
 Kuravaś cāpi ṣaṭ-triṃśad¹⁶ aṣṭā-vimśati¹⁷ Maithilāḥ
 Śūrasenās¹⁸ trayo-vimśad¹⁹ Vītihoṭrās²⁰ ca vimśatiḥ²¹
 ete sarve bhaviṣyanti eka-kālam²² mahikṣitaḥ.

Nandas.

Text—AMt 272, 18–22 ; AVā 99, 326–330 ; Bḍ iii, 74, 139–143.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 4–7 ; GBh xii, 1, 8^b–12.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa give the whole and have a common version in the main. Here for the first time the Bhāgavata gives the tradition in ślokaś, which agree in their purport with those three Purāṇas, and are not a mere list of names. Both versions are placed here, side by side, as they are independent and valuable. The Viṣṇu in prose agrees closely with the Bhāgavata.

All the versions are complete, except that *a*²Mt omit ll. 6–10; *m*Mt l. 9 with a space; *ḍ*Vā ll. 7–9 (first half); *k*Vā ll. 2 (second half), 3, 7, 8; *hp*Mt, *a*¹*k*Vā, and *b*Bh have lost the whole; and *ḷ*Vṣ the matter of the last three Bh verses: *e*Vā omits the whole here, but long afterwards, out of place, inserts it after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi.

The time assigned to Mahāpadma may mean the entire length of his life, as Mt seems to imply; and if so, the whole dynasty may have lasted about a hundred years as stated.

¹⁰ In *j*Mt °śā; *ce*Mt °śa; *f*Mt blends this and the next number into one, thus *catur-vimśat tu*, and so *k*Mt *ṣaṭ-triṃśat tu*.

¹¹ So *G*Vā¹*a*²*a*³*n*Mt, violating the metre. Others save it thus, *b*Mt °śati; *Cy*Mt, *e*Vā °śat tu; *a*³*m*Mt °śās tu; *j*Mt °śā tu; *cde*Mt °śas tu; *l*Mt †aśāti. Vā *catur-vimśat tu*; *g*Vā, *Bd* °śas tu, where the number seems to be a mere repetition of the preceding number.

¹² In *j*Mt *Hehayaḥ*; *e*Vā *Tehayāḥ*.

¹³ So Mt genly, Vā: *fy*Mt *Kāl*°; *l*Mt *Kalindaś*; *e*Mt *Kaliḥśās*. *Bd* †*Ekaliṅgās*.

¹⁴ So Mt genly. Vā reads this half line *dvā-triṃśad vai Kalīṅgās tu*; *Bd* *dvā-triṃśad Eka*°. But *cen*Mt °*dvā-vimśa-d*; *l*Mt °*caturvimśat* (with a syll. extra); *b*Mt °*caturārid*: *e*Vā reads this line—

Āsmakāḥ pañca-vimśac ca ṣaṭ-vimśac ca
 Kalīṅgākāḥ.

¹⁵ So Mt; *b*Mt *Āsmākāḥ*. Vā, *Bd* *pañca-vimśat tath-Āśakāḥ*, prob. Pkt for *tath-Āsmākāḥ*: *m*Vā *crp*: for *e*Vā see note ¹⁴.

¹⁶ So Mt, Vā genly, *Bd*; *n*Mt *ṣaṭ-triṃśad* (= *ṣaṭ-triṃśad*); *k*Vā merely *triṃśad*. *Cb*Vā, *b*Mt *ṣaṭ-triṃśad*: *e*Vā *pañcāśad* here, but afterwards (see p. 23) indefinitely *ūnavimśat tathā c-ābhūd*. These numbers do not agree with the Paurava list, see p. 4.

¹⁷ So *fy*Mt, Vā, *Bd*. Mt genly °śās tu; *dn*Mt °śat tu; *b*Mt °śa tu: *e*Vā *varṣāny aṣṭādaś-aiwa tu* here, but afterwards (see p. 23) agrees with the text.

¹⁸ In *bc*Mt, *d*Vā *Śūras*°; *n*Mt *Suras*°.

¹⁹ In *ce*Mt, *e*Vā °śa; *j*Mt °śā.

²⁰ In *ce*Mt *Vīṭa*°; *e*Vā *Rūtihoṭrās*.

²¹ In *e*Vā °tim.

²² In *j*Mt *Kali-kāle*. See p. 23.

Mt, Vā, and Bđ.

Mahānandi¹-sutaś cāpi
 sūdrāyām³ Kalik-āmsa-jah⁴
 utpatsyate Mahāpadmah
 sarva-kṣatr-āntako⁹ nṛpaḥ
 tataḥ prabhṛti rājāno
 bhaviṣyāḥ sūdra-yonayaḥ
 eka¹²-rāt sa¹³ Mahāpadma
 eka-ccattro¹⁶ bhaviṣyati
 aṣṭāśīti¹⁷ tu varṣāni¹⁸
 prthivyām ca bhaviṣyati¹⁹
 sarva-kṣatram²⁰ ath-ōddhṛtya²¹
 bhāvina-ārthena coditaḥ²³
 Sukalp-ādi²⁴-sūtā²⁵ hy aṣṭau²⁶

Bh (with Vṣ).

Mahānandi¹-suto rājan²
 sūdrā⁵-garbh-ōdbhavo⁶ bali⁷
 Mahāpadma-patiḥ⁸ kaścin
 Nandaḥ kṣatra-vināśa-kṛt¹⁰
 tato nṛpā bhaviṣyanti
 sūdra-prāyās tv¹¹ adhārmikāḥ
 sa eka-ccattrām¹⁴ prthivīm
 an-ullaughita-sāsanaḥ¹⁶
 śāsiṣyati Mahāpaulmo
 dvitiya iva Bhārgavaḥ²²
 tasva cāṣṭau²⁷ bhaviṣvanti

¹ In *fgnMt* °dī; *kBh* °da.

² This vocat. expletive has no doubt ousted some genuine word, which may have been *lubdhah*, because *Vṣ* genly describes him as *ati-lubdha*; *kVṣ* *lubdha*; *eVṣ* 'bhilubdha'; *djVṣ* *ati-buddha*; *kVṣ* *erp*.

³ In *Bđ*, *jMt* °yāḥ; *bVā* sūdrā vā.

⁴ So *Mt* genly; *dMt* °āmsu-jah; *cenMt* °āmsataḥ; *bkMt* °āmsakah; *fMt* °ām-jayah; *jMt* *kālikā...jah*. *Vā*, *Bđ* *kāla-samvṛtaḥ*; *eVā* °samvṛtaḥ; *bVā* *kāla-[pam]samvṛtaḥ*.

⁵ So *akrsBh*, *Vṣ*. *Bh* genly *sūdrī*.

⁶ In *jVṣ* [bha...rno] *garbh-ōd°*; *dVṣ* *jar-mod°*.

⁷ In *fBh* 'rdhali aptly; cf. *Andhras*, note². *Vṣ* has no corresponding word.

⁸ *Vṣ* *Mahāpadmo Nandaḥ*: *lVṣ* °patma always.

⁹ So *Mt*. *Vā* °āntare, altered in *dVā* to °āntako. *Bđ*, *eVā* °ānta-kṛn.

¹⁰ *Vṣ* *akhila-kṣatr-ānta-kāri*.

¹¹ *Tv* omitted in *adrBh*. *Vṣ* sūdrā bhūmi-pālāḥ.

¹² In *kVā* *saka*.

¹³ In *cekMt* *rājā*; *mMt* *padma*; *fMt* *ehya*; *lVā* *su* for *sa*.

¹⁴ In *dBh* °ccattrā-; *jkBh* °kṣatrām; *fBh* *eka-ccattrām sa*.

¹⁵ In *lMt* °kṣatro; *bMt* °mātro; *jMt* *ekas chatro*; *kVā* *ṭekatro*.

¹⁶ *Vṣ* has the same expressions; *kVṣ* *c-aika-chātrā-samullaugh-ānamita-sāsano*.

¹⁷ So all genly: *AjklmMt* °tis; *eMt*, *dVā* °tiḥ; *jVā* *aṣṭāśīti*. *CeklVā* *aṣṭā-vimśati* (omitting *tu*), which *AVā* adopts.

¹⁸ In *cdfjynMt* *sa v°* *eMt* *saṃv°*; *bMt* *saḥsraṇi*.

¹⁹ So *Mt* genly; *bcjnMt* *tu bh°* *dMt* *sa bh°*; *fgMt* *prthivī śobhayisyati*. *Vā*, *Bđ* *prthivīm pālayisyati*.

²⁰ In *Ca²a³gklVā* *kṣatra*; *a¹Vū* *kṣetra*.

²¹ In *CGVā³Mt* *ath-ōtsādyā*, *lMt* *tath-ōt°*; *ceMt* *ath-ōtpātya*, *a¹a²bMt* *tath-ōt°*. *Bđ* *samuddhṛtya*. *Ca¹a²bgklVā* *hṛtodhṛtya* or *hṛtodvṛtya* or corruptions of these; other *Vā* *haroddhṛtya*; *eVā* *athcvṛtya*; *dVā* *tato hatvā*. The correct reading may be *ath-ōtsādyā*, or °ōtpātya or °ōddhṛtya.

²² *Vṣ* *Paraśu-Rāma iv-āparaḥ*.

²³ So *Mt* genly (*cknMt* °noditaḥ); *bMt* *bhavit-ārth°*; *jMt* *bhanitorth°*. *Vā* genly, *Bđ* *bhāvino rīhasya vai balāt*; *lVā* *ṭhasya mahābalāt* (with a syll. extra); *kVā* °thamābalāt; *a²Vā* °thān mahābalān; *eVā* *Viśvanāthasya vai balāt*. *Vā*, *Bđ* have the same expression in *AVā* 88, 80, 95; 101, 60; *Bđ* iii, 63, 79, 94; iv, 2, 59.

²⁴ So *Mt* mostly: *fgMt* *Sukulp°* or *Sukuly°*; *kMt* *Sukul°*; *blnMt* *Sumāly°*; *ceMt* *Kuśal°*; *eVā* *Sahaly-ādyāḥ*; *jMt* *ṭSatulyā vai*: *a²Vā* *saṃhasvāt sa*, *fVā* °svātstat, *mVā* °svāt (one syll. short); *dVā* *saṃhāsvās tat*: 3 MSS of *CVā* *sahavāt tat*, 3 MSS of *CVā* and *a¹a²Vā* °srās tat (which *AVā* adopts); *gVā* *hamsa-*

Mt, Vā, and Bđ.

samā dvādaśa te nṛpāḥ ²⁸
Mahāpadmasya paryāye ³⁰
bhaviṣyanti nṛpāḥ kramāt ³²
uddharisyati tām sarvām
Kauṭilyo vai dvir aṣṭabhiḥ ³⁶
bhuktṡā ³⁷ mahīm ³⁸ varṣa-śataim
tato ⁴¹ Mauryān gamiṣyati ⁴².

Bh (with Vṣ).

Sumālya-pramukhāḥ ²⁹ sutāḥ
ya imām bhokṣyanti mahīm ³¹
rājānaḥ sma ³³ śataim ³⁴ samāḥ
nava Nandān dvijaḥ kaścit
prapannān uddharisyati ³⁶
teṣām abhāve ³⁹ jagatim ⁴⁰
Mauryābhokṣyanti ⁴³ vai Kalau. 10

Mauryas.

Text—AMt 272, 23–26 ; AVā 99, 331–336 ; Bđ iii, 74, 144–149.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 7–8 ; GBh xii, 1, 13–16^a.

This dynasty is given by all five Purāṇas, but the account of it has suffered more than that of any other dynasty ¹. Three versions exist here, the earliest in the

svās tat. Bđ tat-paścāt tat.

²⁵ In *bfgMt* *śutā*; *eVā* *satā*.

²⁶ *Hy* omitted in *jMt*; *bMt* †*svamtyai*, corrected in margin to *hy aṣṭau*; *gVā* *hy etc.*

²⁷ In *dBh* *tataś c°*; *eBh* *yasya c°*; *qBh* *tasya tvāṣṭau*, *gBh* *tasyāvā°*. *Vṣ* *tasy-āpy aṣṭau sutāḥ*.

²⁸ In *jMt* *vai nṛpāḥ*; *kMt* *saṁsmṛtāḥ*.

²⁹ In *hklVṣ* *Sumāly-ādyāḥ*; *abVṣ* *Sumāl-ā°*; *Vṣ* genly *Sumaty-ā°*; *fyVṣ* *Sumaty-ā°*.

³⁰ In *gMt*, *fmVā* *°yāyo*; *dVā* *payāye* altered to *dāyādā*; *eVā* *bhāryāyām*.

³¹ In *dBh* *prthivīm*; *fBh* *ye bhokṣyanti mahīm etām*: v.r. in *GBh* *mahīm bhokṣyanti ya imām*.

³² In *kMt* *nṛp-ōttamāḥ*.

³³ *Ca* in *arsBh*.

³⁴ In *kBh* *taśam*. *Vṣ* agrees—

Mahāpadmaḥ tat-putrāś ca ekam varṣa-śatam avanī-patayo bhaviṣyanti.

³⁵ So *Vā* genly: *jVā* *dvir aṣṭatīḥ*; *eVā* *driṣṭāṣṭibhiḥ*; *aVā* *mahābalaḥ*. *Bđ* agrees, but ends *dvija-rṣabhaḥ*, which may be the true reading (see *Bh* reading). *Mt* reads differently—

uddharisyati Kauṭilyaḥ samair dvādaśa-bhiḥ sutān:

where *bMt* ends *sutāḥ*; *cnMt* *sa tām*; *fMt* *sa tā*; *gMt* *śatam*; *jMt* *samāt*; *kMt* *kramāt*. For *dvādaśabhiḥ* read perhaps *dvija-rṣabhaḥ*. After this line *bfglnMt* insert the first line of the next dynasty,

³⁶ In *lBh* *prapannān uddharisyati*. *Vṣ* says—*nav=aiwa* tām Nandān¹ Kauṭilyo¹ brāh-
maṇaḥ samuddharisyati*:

where **hVṣ* *nava vai*, *jVṣ* *navai*, *kVṣ* *nav-aitā*, *aVṣ* *tath=aira*; **hVṣ* *tām pyaśokaḥ*, *kVṣ* *Nandavala*; **jkVṣ* *Koṭilyo*.

³⁷ In *fmVā* *bhuktā*.

³⁸ In *nMt*, *kVā* *mahā*. *Bhuktā mahī* would be better.

³⁹ In *fBh* *abhāvāj*.

⁴⁰ In *dBh* *prthivīm*.

⁴¹ In *eVā* *Nandair*.

⁴² So *CGVāMt*, *eVā*, *mahī* being understood: *fMt* *°Mauryaṁ*; *eMt* *°gaur yām*; *eMt* *°gaur yaṁ*; *bgMt* *°mokṣam*; *lMt* *°ekah*; *aVā* *kMt* *°mokṣo bhaviṣyati*; *jMt* boldly paraphrases it, *prāpsyanti paramām gatim*. *Vā* differently; mostly *Nand-ēn/luḥ sa bhaviṣyati (dVā, sambhav°)*: one MS^a of *CVā* *Nandendah°*, and so *dVā* but altered to *nandanaḥ*; *aVā* *Nandendrah°*; *aVā* *Nandr-ēndrah°*, so *mVā* *crp*; *bVā* *Nandethā°*; *kVā* *crp*. The true reading is prob. *Nand-ēndrah*, of which all the others are easy misreadings. *Bđ* *narendrah°*.

⁴³ Similarly *Vṣ*—*teṣām abhāve Mauryāś^a ca prthivīm bhokṣyanti*: where **kVṣ* *So[da]-ryāḥ*.

¹ Because its great fame in Buddhism disgraced it in brahmanical eyes?

Matsya, the second in *eVāyu*, and the third in the *Vāyu* generally and the *Brahmāṇḍa*. They agree in general purport but have many differences. The second forms a stage of recension intermediate between the first and the third, and is the only copy that has preserved the names of all the kings. The Matsya version in all copies is incomplete and has one of its verses (v. 23) misplaced; thus, only 5 MSS mention Candragupta, the second king is always omitted, and the account generally begins with that verse 23, putting the last two kings first, and then mentions only four kings, Aśoka and his three successors. All three versions are important, but cannot be reconciled merely by criticism; and, as they cannot all be exhibited side by side, the Matsya version is given first, and the two other versions are printed side by side; but in the Matsya version verse 23 has been removed to its proper place after verses 24 and 25.

The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata mention the kings in the same order as the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* with some differences in names, but the latter omits Daśaratha, and *b/Bh* want the whole.

In the Matsya version, *jMt* omits lines 4, 5, 8, 9; *kMt* l. 8, and inserts l. 9 after l. 12 of the following Suṅga dynasty; *hMt* want the whole. In the *Vāyu* version, *aVā* omits ll. 1-3; *kVā* ll. 12, 13; *gVā* has only ll. 1-5; *hVā* wants the whole. In *eVā* the account is omitted at first, and inserted long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi.

The versions vary in the number of the kings. *Mt* says 10, but names only 7; *eVā* says 9 but gives 12; *Vā* and *Bd* say 9 and mention 9. *Vṣ* says 10 and names 10. *Bh* says 10 but gives only 9. The best attested number is 10, and the omissions can be particularized: but *eVā* combines the *Mt* and *Vā* versions and has probably duplicated two kings in the middle.

All agree that the dynasty lasted 137 years. The regnal periods added together (excluding the *Mt* list which is incomplete) are 160 years in *eVā*, and (*Śāliśūka* being omitted) 133 in *Vā* and *Bd*; or, if we add *Śāliśūka*'s reign to the latter, the total is 146 years; and the total in *eVā* would be reduced to about 145 years if we correct its duplication in the middle. This figure, 145 or 146, is compatible with the stated duration, 137 years, if (as is probable) the total of the several reigns is nominally raised above the true total by reckoning fractions of years as whole years.

Matsya.

*Kauṭilyaś Candraguptam tu tato rājye 'bhīṣekṣyati¹
 ṣaṭ-triṃśat tu samā rājā² bhavitz Aśoka³ eva ca
 saptānām⁴ daśa varṣāṇi tasya naptā bhaviṣyati (24)

¹ This line is found only in *bfglnMt* where it is misplaced (see p. 26, note²⁵); *bMt* *Kotiśaś Candraguptaś*^o; *nMt* *Kauṭilyaś Candraguptasya tato rāṣṭre*^o; and *lMt* ends *rāṣṭre niveṣya*.

² But *cnMt* *°samā rājā tu (n, ṣaṭtriṃśat = ṣaṭ-triṃśat)*; *bMt* *ṣaṭ-triṃśati samān rājā*.

³ So *dfgkmMt*; *jMt* *°Aśoka*: *Mt* genly

°Aśaka; *ceMt* *°Ākośa*; *lMt* *°Āyoda v-eva ca*. Instead of the double expletive the true reading might be *°Aśokavardhanaḥ* as in *Vṣ*, *Bh*.

⁴ So *Mt* genly; *dMt* *°saptāno* (or *°nām*); *lMt* *°sātānām*. Can the true reading be *Suyasā*, who is named by *Vṣ* and *Bh*? Cf. *daśonah saptā* in *eVā* version, l. 7.

rājā Daśaratho ⁵ 'ṣṭau ⁶ tu tasya putro bhaviṣyati ⁷
 bhavitā nava varṣāṇi tasya putras ca ⁸ Sampratiḥ ⁹ (25)
 bhavitā Śatadhanvā ¹⁰ ca ¹¹ tasya putras ¹² tu ṣaṭ samāḥ ¹³
 Brhadrathas tu ¹⁴ varṣāṇi tasya putras ca ¹⁵ saptatiḥ ¹⁶ (23)
 ity ete daśa ¹⁷ Mauryās tu ye bhokṣyanti ¹⁸ vasundharām
 sapta-trimśac-chatam ¹⁹ pūrṇam tebhyaḥ Śuṅgān ²⁰ gamiṣyati ²¹ (26)

eVāyu.

Candraguptam nṛpaṁ rājye
 Kōṭilyaḥ sthāpayiṣyati
 catur-vimśat samā rājā
 Candragupto bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā Nandasāras ²³ tu
 pañca-vimśat samā nṛpaḥ
 ṣaṭ-trimśat tu samā rājā
 bhavit-Āśoka eva ca
 tasya putraḥ Kulālas ²³ tu
 varṣāṇy aṣṭau bhaviṣyati

Vā genly and Bḍ.

Candraguptam nṛpaṁ rājye
 Kauṭilyaḥ sthāpayiṣyati ²²
 catur-vimśat samā rājā
 Candragupto bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā Bhadrāsāras ²⁴ tu
 pañca-vimśat samā nṛpaḥ
 ṣaṭ-trimśat ²⁵ tu ²⁶ samā rājā ²⁷
 Āśoko bhavitā nṛṣu ²⁸
 tasya putraḥ Kunālas ³⁰ tu
 varṣāṇy aṣṭau bhaviṣyati

5

⁵ In cMt °rath-aṣṭau : see note ³⁵.

⁶ Jyau in bMt; dMt au.

⁷ In a²cMt bhaviṣyanti ca tat-sutāḥ.

⁸ Tu in bfgnMt.

⁹ Mt genly taptatiḥ; dnMt °ti. Emended to Sampratiḥ as in eVā; see note ³⁶.

¹⁰ In nMt Śadadh°; mMt Sudh°.

¹¹ Tu in bcdefgjnMt.

¹² Putrās in a²bdMt.

¹³ In fyMt tat-samāḥ; lMt ṣaṣṭhamāḥ; mMt padmapaḥ.

¹⁴ In dMt °rathasya.

¹⁵ In dejnMt tu; bfMt putrasya.

¹⁶ So Mt genly, probably a misreading of sapta vai in Pkt form; see Vā, Bḍ, and Introdn. § 41: eMt vimśatiḥ.

¹⁷ So all MSS, though they name only 6, or 7 at most.

¹⁸ In bMt bhokṣyanti ca as in Vā, Bḍ.

¹⁹ In cenMt sapta-vimśa-śatam.

²⁰ In dMt Śuṅgān; ceMt Śuṅgām; kMt svargaṁ; bMt svargi; lMt sarva.

²¹ Vasundharā being understood : see p. 26, note ⁴²; Śuṅgas, note ⁵¹.

²² Vṣ says—Kauṭilya eva Candraguptam rājye bhīṣekṣyati; where kVṣ has Kauṇḍilya.

Bh says—

sa eva Candraguptam vai dvijo rājye
 'bhīṣekṣyati.

²³ So eVā, instead of Vindusāras.

²⁴ So Vā genly, Bḍ. Vṣ rightly Vindusāra. Bh Vāris°; gBh Vāris°; emBh Vārikāra. Both add, 'son of Candragupta'; Vṣ tāsy-
 āpi putro, Bh tat-suto.

²⁵ Śaḍ-vimśat in Ca²a⁴Vā only, which AVā adopts.

²⁶ In gVā ca; fmVā sa.

²⁷ In fmVā mahā-rājā.

²⁸ So Vā. Vṣ, Bh call him Āśokavārdhana; jVṣ Āśoka°; fBh Aloka°; kVṣ Ayosoka°: see Appendix II, § 1. Bḍ Āśokānām ca tṛpti-duḥ, perhaps a play on the name.

²⁹ An easy misreading of Kunālas.

³⁰ So CVā here and in next line. But a¹-bdfgklmVā, Bḍ Kuśālas, jVā Kaśālas, which all have Kuśāla- in next line, except bVā Nuśāla- and lost in gVā. Vṣ, Bh call Āśoka's successor Suyāśas; chVṣ Svay°; gVṣ Stuy°; bVṣ Sudhaśāḥ. Kunāla is so named and said to have been Āśoka's son in Buddhist books, e.g. Divyāvadana, pp. 403, 406 ff, 430.

eVāyu.

Kulāla-tanayās c-āṣṭau
 bhoktāro Bandhupālītāḥ ³²
 Daśonah sapta ³³ varṣāṇi
 teṣāṁ naptā bhaviṣyati
 rājā Daśarathas tv ³⁵ aṣṭau
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 bhavitā nava varṣāṇi
 tasya putras tu Sampratiḥ ³⁶
 Śālīsūkāḥ ³⁷ samā rājā
 trayodaśa bhaviṣyati
 sapta varṣāṇi ³⁸ Devadharmā
 bhaviṣyati narādhipaḥ
 rājā Śatadhanuś c-āṣṭau
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 Vṛhadrathas tu varṣāṇi
 saptāśītim ⁴³ bhaviṣyati

³¹ In dVā *adau*, altered to *ādan*; bVā *ādan*: mVā °sūnur [*atrunur*] aṣṭau.

³² Sic, showing that the preceding plurals are probably wrong, through misreading *aṣṭau* as applying to *tanaya* instead of as years. The line should probably be—

Kulāla-tanayās c-āṣṭau bhoktā vai Bandhupālītāḥ.

³⁵ Compare l. 3 of Mt version. There seems to be some metathesis.

³⁴ Ca° a°klVā read *daśamānīndrapālītāḥ*; a°a°fmVā *daśa*°; bVā *daśamānīnd*° (altered in d to *daśamānīnd*°); jVā *daśamānandrapālītā*. • Bd *bhavitā c-Īndrapālītāḥ*, which suggests that Vā reading should be *daśa bhāv-Īndrapālītāḥ*, and I have emended it so: but it might also be *daś-ābdān Indra*° as suggested in CVā.

³⁶ Actually *carṣasamāsr*, no doubt for *Daśarathas tv* (see l. 4 of Mt), and I have emended it so, since Vṣ agrees in this name and places him after *Suyāśas* (see note ³⁰): cVṣ *Dāśaratha*; bVṣ *Dāśaratna*. Bh omits him. Three of his records are extant, see Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos. 954–6, in Epig. Ind. x, Appendix.

³⁸ Cf. note°. *Samprati* is the Sanskrit

Vā genly and Bd.

Kunāla-sūnur aṣṭau ³¹ ca
 bhoktā vai Bandhupālītāḥ
 Bandhupālita-dāyādo
 daśa bhāv-Īndrapālītāḥ ³⁴

10

bhavitā sapta varṣāṇi
 Devavarmā ³⁹ narādhipaḥ
 rājā Śatadhanuś ⁴⁰ c-āṣṭau ⁴¹
 tasya putro bhaviṣyati
 Bṛhadrathas ⁴² ca varṣāṇi
 sapta ⁴⁴ vai bhavitā nṛpaḥ

form of Pali *Sampadī*. *Sampadī* was Kunāla's son (*Divyāvadana*, p. 430), and was established in the kingdom (*id.* p. 433, where his descendants are named). See SBE, xxii, 290 note, for *Samprati*. Vṣ, Bh place a king *Saigata* here, which is no doubt another reading of the same name; dBh *Samputa*, an easy misreading of *Samprata*. Bh adds 'son of *Suyāśas*', *Suyāśas-sūtāḥ*.

³⁷ First *Śālīsūkāḥ*, then corrected to °śūkāḥ. Vṣ, Bh corroborate. Bh, cVṣ *Śālīsūkā*; Vṣ genly, sBh °śūka; jVṣ °śmūka; bVṣ °śūlla: lVṣ *Śālaśūka*. Bh genly *Śālīsūkās tatas tasya*; jBh °kas tu *Suyāśas*, where *Suyāśas* is meant for a genitive.

³⁴ Actually *varṇanī*; see Appendix I, § 1.

³⁹ In bVā *Dacav*°. Vṣ, Bh *Somāśarman*.

⁴⁰ So Bd. Vṣ, Bh *Śatadhanuś*; kBh *Sata*°; hBh *Śata*°; deVṣ *Saśa*°: lVṣ *Śatadharman*; qBh *śatayitvā*. Vā *Śatadharas*.

⁴¹ So Vā. Bd merely c-āpi.

⁴² So Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree; cBh *Ūhad*°. Vā *Vṛhadāśvas*, but has correct name *Bṛhadratha* in p. 31, l. 1: mVā omits *ca*.

⁴³ Sic.

⁴⁴ In dVā *sama*; bVā *sanu*.

eVāyu.

ity ete nava Mauryās⁴⁵ tu
ye bhokṣyanti vasundharām
sapta-trimśac-chatam pūrṇam
tebhyaḥ Śuṅgo⁵⁰ bhaviṣyati.

Vā genly and Bḍ.

ity ete nava⁴⁶ Mauryā vai⁴⁷
bhokṣyanti ca⁴⁸ vasundharām
sapta-trimśac-chatam pūrṇam⁴⁹
tebhyaḥ Śuṅgo⁵¹ gamiṣyati⁵². 15

Śuṅgas.

Text—AMt 272, 27-32^a; AVā 99, 337-343^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 150-156^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 9-11; GBh xii, 1, 16^b-19^a.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole; except that most copies of the Matsya omit l. 8, and all omit l. 3. The Viṣṇu gives a list of the kings, and the Bhāgavata all except the first.

As regards MSS, *ce*Mt invert lines 4, 5; *l*Mt omits ll. 1-6, 13 and inserts ll. 1, 2, 5, 6 at the end; *u*Mt omits ll. 4, 5; *g*Vā has only l. 2; *e*Vā omits this dynasty here and inserts it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāṇi: *hp*Mt, *h*Vā, and *b*Bh want the whole.

The duration of the dynasty is stated by Vā and Bḍ, and by Vṣ generally, to be 112 years; by 7 MSS of Bh and one of Vṣ, 110; and by Bh generally 'over 100 years'. Mt reads 'hundreds two' wrongly for 'ten, two', and with this correction says 112 years. The duration therefore was 112 years. The aggregate of the reigns is 118 years. These virtually agree, if the total of the reigns was nominally raised above the true total by reckoning fractions of years as whole years.

Of the time of the Śuṅgas there are two records, nos. 687, 688 in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions in Epig. Ind. x, Appendix. Another record assigned to their time, no. 905 in that list, mentions a king Bhāgavata, but he does not appear to be the Śuṅga king Bhāgavata, as the lineage is quite different.

⁴⁵ Actually *nava Mlawryyās* (an easy misreading of *nava*): but it has mentioned 12 kings.

⁴⁶ So Vā, Bḍ: *nava* may have been substituted since they name only 9 kings. Vṣ names and says 10—

evam Mauryā* daśa¹ bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti abda²-śataṁ sapta-trimśad³-uttaram: where **k*Vṣ *Soryyā*, *l*Vṣ *Mauryā* [*dayo*], see Appendix II, § 1: ¹*j*Vṣ *adda*, *h*Vṣ *aṣṭa*, *k*Vṣ *arū*: ²*h*Vṣ *vimśad*. Bh says 10, though it names only 9—

Mauryā hy ete* daśa nṛpāḥ sapta-trimśac chat-ōttaram

samā bhokṣyanti pṛthivīm Kalau, Kurukul-ōdvaha:

where **j*rBh *tv ete*, *a*Bh *te te*: *d*Bh reads the first line thus—

Maur[v]yā ete śata-nṛpāḥ sapta-trimś-ōttaram śatam.

⁴⁷ So Bḍ; *a*¹Vā *Mūrjā vai*; *a*²*a*³*h**k**l*Vā *Mūrtyā*⁴; *d*Vā *nava* [*Su*]Mūrtyā⁵ (altered to *Naṇḍa-sambhūtā* wrongly): *fn*Vā *Mauryā ye*, *Cā*²*g*Vā *bhūpā ye*; *j*Vā *yoyā* (or *yopā*) *yo*.

⁴⁸ In *a*²*a*³*a*⁴*bd*Vā *ye bhokṣyanti*: *kl*Vā *yo*.

⁴⁹ Similarly Vṣ, Bh; see note⁴⁶: *d*Vā *chataṁ* (altered to *chatāt*) *pūrṇat*.

⁵⁰ Actually *Śuṅko*.

⁵¹ So *a*¹*bd**g**lm*Vā, Bḍ; *k*Vā *Śugo*; CVā *tu gaur*: but *a*²-*j*Vā *Śuṅgān*, which AVā adopts and seems preferable.

⁵² CVā *bhaviṣyati*. Vṣ says—

teṣāṁ ante* pṛthivīm¹ Śuṅgā bhokṣyanti: where **l*Vṣ *avretām*; ²*abh*Vṣ add *daśa*: *j*Vṣ *crp*. Bh omits this statement.

Puṣyamitras¹ tu senānīr² uddhṛtya³ sa⁴ Brhadratham⁵
 kārayiṣyati⁶ vai rājyañ
 ṣaṭ-trimśati⁷ samā nṛpaḥ
 Agnimitraḥ sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ¹⁰
 bhavitāpi Vasujyeṣṭhaḥ¹¹
 sapta¹³ varṣāṇi vai nṛpaḥ¹⁴
 Vasumitraḥ¹⁶ suto¹⁰ bhāvyo daśa varṣāṇi pārthivaḥ¹⁷
 tato 'ndhrakāḥ¹⁸ same dve tu¹⁹ tasya putro bhaviṣyati²⁰

¹ So Mt genly, lVṣ. Vā genly, kMt, Bḍ, Vṣ *Puṣpa*^o; ceMt, dfkmVā *Putra*^o here, but *Puṣpa*^o or *Puṣya*^o in l. 3 (see note¹⁰); kVṣ *Prakhyā*^o by an easy misreading: nMt *Puṣpamitrasya* (omitting *tu*): bVā *Putra*ḥ. Bh omits him. Vṣ says—

tataḥ Puṣpamitraḥ senā-patiḥ svāmināñ
 hatvā rājyañ kariṣyati.

² In ceMt *sa se*^o; bVā *su-se*^o; gMt *senā-*
sanūr; eMt omits *tu*.

³ In bfjMt, eVā, uddhṛtya; ceknMt *sam-*
uddhṛtya (omitting *sa*).

⁴ So Mt, eVā: jMt *ca*. Vā genly *vai*:
 bdfmVā, Bḍ *tu*.

⁵ So Vā, Bḍ, jMt. Mt genly *°thān*; eVā
°thah: cekMt *sadā grhāt*.

⁶ So Mt: jMt *kariṣyati sa*.

⁷ So Mt genly; nMt *ṣaṭ-trimśati* (= *ṣaṭ-*
trimśati). ACjkMt *ṣaṭ-trimśat tu*.

⁸ So Vā, Bḍ.

⁹ So Vā. Bḍ *sa c-aiva*. These readings
 are no doubt corruptions of *ṣaṭ-trimśad eva*
 in Pkt form.

¹⁰ This line is only in Vā, Bḍ. Bḍ has—

Agnimitro nṛpaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā
 nṛpaḥ;

where the first *nṛpaś* should no doubt be
sutaś. Vā reads—

Puṣpamitra-sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyanti samā
 nṛpāḥ;

where singulars have obviously been wrongly
 converted into plurals through misapplying
aṣṭau to *suta* instead of to *samā*. It should
 be—

Puṣpamitra-sutaś c-aṣṭau bhaviṣyati samā
 nṛpaḥ;

as eVā shows by its reading—

tat-suto 'guimitr-aṣṭau* bhaviṣyati samā
 nṛpāḥ;

where read *°mitro 'ṣṭau and 'nṛpaḥ. Vṣ

and Bh name *Agnimitra*. Vṣ adds *asy-*
ātmajo, 'son of Puṣyamitra'.

¹¹ So Mt genly: gjMt *bhavitā vai Vasuśre-*
ṣṭhaḥ; fMt *°tā c-aiva Sas*^o; ceMt *°tā c*
 (ceMt *v*)=*Asurajyeṣṭhaḥ*; bMt *°tā c-āpi Sujye-*
ṣṭhaḥ (and lMt *erp*), as in Vā, Bḍ.

¹² So *a²afkmVā*, Bḍ. Vṣ genly and Bh
 agree. In eVā *Sajy*^o; Ca¹a²lVā *taj-jy*^o;
 bVṣ *Sujeṣṭa*; jVā *Sudyataḥ*; bḍVā *Suṣaṣṭhaḥ*
 (altered in *d* to *Susthaṣṭhaḥ*); kVṣ *Jyegṭha*;
 hVṣ *erp*. *Sutaḥ* added in aBh.

¹³ In bMt *sama*.

¹⁴ In fgjMt *tataḥ*.

¹⁵ So all; except ceMt, a¹-a²Vā *°mitra-*;
 lMt *Vasuputras*; jMt *°āgumitras*; dMt
Sumitras tu.

¹⁶ So Vā genly, ceMt. Bḍ, eVā *tato*. Mt
 genly *tathā*.

¹⁷ So Vā, Bḍ: beMt *vai nṛpaḥ*. Mt genly
vai tataḥ. After this king kVṣ inserts
 a king *Vajramitra* besides the *Vajramitra*
 in l. 9.

¹⁸ There is great variation in this name.
 Vā genly *'ndhrakāḥ*; kMt, a²Vā *'ndhakāḥ*
 (kVā *tsāṇḍhakāḥ*): 4 MSS of CVā *Dhru-*
kaḥ; fmVā *Dhrakaḥ*; 2 MSS of CVā *Vrkaḥ*:
 Mt genly *'ntakāḥ*; eMt *Taka*; jMt *Nukaḥ*;
 lMt *ṣṭakāḥ*. All these should prob. be read
 with *avagraha*. Vṣ genly *Āndraka*; bhVṣ
Odruka. Bḍ *Bhadraḥ*; eVā *Madraḥ*. Bh
 genly *Bhadraḥ*; gBh *Bhad*^o. *Andhraka*
 seems most probable.

¹⁹ So Mt genly, bdefkmVā, Bḍ. Vā genly
samā^o; dMt *samā*^c; ceMt *samā drav tu*:
 but a²nMt *samāḥ sapta*; kMt *sumohantus*.

²⁰ So Mt; jMt *putrau bhaviṣyataḥ*. This
 half line is in a²a¹kVā *bhaviṣyati suto 'sya*
vai; bVā *°sutaṣya*^o; defmVā *°sutaṣya*^o
 (altered in *d* to *°sutaiḥ sa*^o); Ca¹a²Vā *°sutaś*
ca^o. Bḍ *°nṛpaś ca vai*.

bhaviṣyati ²¹ samās ²² tasmāt ²³
 trīṇy evaṃ ²⁷ sa Pulindakah ²⁸
 bhaviṣyati ca Yomeghas ³¹
 trīṇi varṣāṇi vai tataḥ
 bhavitā Vajramitras tu ³¹
 samā rājā punar nava ³⁷
 dvā-trimśat tu ³⁹ Samābhāgaḥ ⁴⁰
 Samābhāgāt tato ⁴² nṛpaḥ ⁴³
 bhaviṣyati sutas tasya Devabhūmih ⁴⁵ samā daśa ⁴⁶

bhaviṣyati ²⁴ samās ²⁵ tasmāt :
 tisra-eva ²⁹ Pulindakah ³⁰
 rājā Ghoṣaḥ sutaś ³² cāpi
 varṣāṇi bhavitā trayah ³³
 sapta ³⁵ vai Vajramitras ³⁶ tu
 samā rājā tataḥ punaḥ ³⁸
 dvā-trimśad bhavitā cāpi ⁴¹
 samā Bhāgavato ⁴⁴ nṛpaḥ 10

²¹ So Mt: cMt °syanti.

²² Samas in CMt.

²³ In bMt tasyās.

²⁴ So bdemVā, Bḍ. Vā genly °syanti.

²⁵ In lVā sutās: ucdfyhjklnqrBh say sutaḥ.

²⁶ In eVā tasya.

²⁷ So Mt genly: bnMt °eva; kMt trīṇi vai; dfjgmMt tisro vai. See Appendix I, § iii.

²⁸ So Mt mostly: bMt sa Pulindakah: mMt °Anandanah, jMt Madhunan°; fgMt Marunan°; dMt Medhunanakah: kMt merely nṛpaḥ: ceMt read this half line trīṇi varṣāṇi vai tataḥ, giving no name.

²⁹ In eVā triṇiśrava or triṇi°.

³⁰ So mVā. Bḍ and other Vā read the plural °kāḥ wrongly: eVā Mulindakah. Vṣ genly Pulindaka; lVṣ Puḷ°; kVṣ Pra-liṅga. Bh Pulinda.

³¹ This line is only in dfjgmMt. So dfjMt, but fg omit ca: mMt °va Yomegha; jMt °sa Momeghas. Yome may be a misreading of Ghoṣa, see note ³².

³² Vā genly Ghoṣa (mVā Dhoṣa) sutaś, for Ghoṣaḥ sutaś, as Bh has. Bḍ and dVā Ghoṣas tataḥ. Vṣ genly Ghoṣavasū; bVṣ Ghoṣaka; kVṣ Yoṣavasū; hVṣ by inversion Soghavamū; cBh Ghopa: eVā has a different line—

trīṇi varṣāṇi bhavitā rājā Ghoṣavasur nṛpaḥ.

³³ So Vā and Bḍ. See Appendix I, § iii.

³⁴ So Mt genly, eVā; eMt Vajramitras; kMt Yajram°: fgMt bhaviṣyate Vajramitraḥ; jMt Vajramitras ca bhavitā.

³⁵ So Bḍ. Vā tato.

³⁶ So Bḍ. Bh and Vṣ genly agree: hBh Vajramitra; cBh Vajrā°; ekBh Vraja°; nBh Paṇna°; fgVṣ Pakṣa°; cVṣ Paḍrā°; pBh

Vajramindra. Vā genly Vikramitras; dVā Vikr°.

³⁷ So cMt; dfjgmMt navaḥ; emMt navā: other Mt bhavaḥ.

³⁸ So Vā, Bḍ; eVā catur-daśa.

³⁹ So Mt genly; cemMt ca for tu; dMt omits tu; bfgMt dvā-trimśati; jMt sa dvā-trimśat.

⁴⁰ Samābh° in cMt; eMt Samāmbh°.

⁴¹ So Vā. Bḍ vāpi.

⁴² So Mt genly; beMt Samābh°; kMt samā bhoktā°; jMt Samābhāg-ānugo.

⁴³ Vṣaḥ in bMt, adding an extra king.

⁴⁴ So Vā, Bḍ. Bh and Vṣ genly agree; cemBh Bhāgavato.

⁴⁵ So Mt, eVā, Bḍ. Vā Kṣemabhūmih here but Deva° in the next list (l. 2). Vṣ Devabhūti. Bh Derabhūtir iti śrutah; gBh °bhūr iti viś°, but °bhūti afterwards.

⁴⁶ In eMt vaśuḥ.

⁴⁷ So dfjgmMt, dVā, Bḍ, and 2 MSS of CVā: a'a'klVā and 4 MSS of CVā Śrīga; bVā Ścuṅga. Vā genly tuṅga: eVā Śaṅka; cMt Śuddha; eMt Śrudha. Mt genly kṣudra: jMt trayodaś-Āṅga; kMt has this half line, ity ete daśa Maurrās tu [me]. Vṣ says—

ity ete daśa* Śuṅgā dvādaś'-ōttaram vaiṣa-śatam prthivīm °bhokṣyanti; tataḥ Kaṇvān' eṣā' bhūr yāsyati:

where *lVṣ dvādaśa; °aVṣ daś-; °lVṣ Kāṇvān; °kVṣ eṣān. Bh has—

Śuṅgā* daś-aite bhokṣyanti bhūmim ° varṣa-śat-ādihikam

tataḥ Kaṇvān iyam bhūmir yāsyaty alpa-guṇān, nṛpa:

where °deBh Śuṅgā, hBh Sumbhā; °cehjkmlBh daśa (marg. correction bhūmim in jBh).

daśaite Śuṅga⁴⁷-rājāno bhokṣyant-āmān⁴⁸ vasundharām
śatam pūrṇam⁴⁹ daśa dve ca⁵⁰ tataḥ⁵¹ Kaṇvān⁵² gamiṣyati⁵³.

Kāṇvāyanas (Śuṅgabhr̥tyas).

Text—AMt 272, 32^b-37; AVā 99, 343^b-347; Bḍ iii, 74, 156^b-160^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 12; GBh xii, 1, 19^b-21.

The Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole; but they all differ in the last part, where the Matsya version is placed on the left, the Vāyu on the right, and the Brahmāṇḍa in the notes along with the concluding parts of the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata. The names Kaṇva, Kāṇva, and Kāṇvāyana are often sadly corrupted, and many of the variations are mentioned in the notes to show how simple and well-known names can be corrupted.

As regards MSS, *bḍfjblm*Mt omit line 6; *gVā* has only the last line; *eVā* omits the whole here and inserts it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāuḥ: *hp*Mt, *hVā*, *hVṣ*, and *bt*Bh want the whole.

The duration of the dynasty is stated to be 45 years and agrees with the aggregate of the reigns.

Amātyo Vasudevas¹ tu bālyād vyasaninām nṛpam²

⁴⁷ In *dMt* °gyante tām; *bMt* °gyanty eva; *jMt* bhogyante te.

⁴⁸ In *bMt* śara-pūrṇa-.

⁴⁹ So Vā, Bḍ: *fmVā darā dve ca*; *hVā* †daśarddava. Mt *śate dve ca*: *jMt* reads this line—

aṣṭā-trimś-ādhikā samyag varṣāṇām śata-
pañcakam.

⁵⁰ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ *tebhyah*.

⁵¹ Bḍ *Kaṇvaṇ*; *eVā* *Kaṇtho*; *mVā* *Kaṇga*; *hfVā* *Kaṇvā*; *dVā* *Kaṇvo*. Vā genly *kin vā*: *a'aVā Śaikam*. Mt genly *Śuṅgān*; *nMt* *Śuṅgaṇ*; *ceMt* *tuṅgo*; *dMt* *Śuṅgād gāna*: *a'blMt* *svargaṇ*, °gī, °ga; *fyMt* boldly read this half line, *taśas te svarga-gāminah*. *Kaṇvān* seems the correct word, if we read *gamiṣyati*.

⁵² *Mahā* being understood, see p. 28, note ²¹. But *blMt*, *eVā* *bhaviṣyati*; *oenMt* *haniṣyati*, which would be good, if we read *tataḥ Śuṅgān haniṣyati*.

¹ So Mt genly, *eVā*, Bḍ: *dmMt* *Vās°*; *bMt* *Vasudevasya* (omitting *tu*). Vā genly

apārthivasudevas; *CVā* °devam; *dVā* °vaḥ *Sudevas*. Vṣ says—

Devabhūtim tu Śuṅga-rājānaṁ vyasaninām*
tasya-iv=āmātyaḥ Kaṇvo¹ Vasudeva-nāmā
nipātya † svayam avanim bhoktā:

where * *hVṣ vyavaśīnaṁ*; † *IVṣ Kāṇvo*, *hVṣ Kāśvā*; † *IVṣ* *Vasudeva-nām-āpatya*. Bh has—

Śuṅgaṇ hatvā Devabhūtim* Kaṇvo
'mātyas¹ tu † kāmīnam

svayam kariṣyate rājyaṇ¹ Vasudevo
mahā-matiḥ:

where * *hBh* °bhṛtīm, *lBh* °hūtim; † *dBh* *Kaṇv-āmātyas*; † *hBh* *śu*; † *dBh* *ca bhokṣyate rājyaṇ*, *qBh* *kariṣye rājyaṇ ca*. See p. 32, note ⁴⁵.

² So Vā genly, *Pd*: *fvā bālyā-vy°*; *eVā* *balad vyesaninām nṛpaḥ*; *lVā* *balyāml rasati nṛpam*. But *a'a'a'cefyklm*Mt *prasahya* (cen, °hyā) *vyasanī* (n, °nīr; l, °nā) *nṛpam* (l, °paḥ; a'a'a'cek, °pa); where the true reading should be *prasahya vyasanīm nṛpam*, see Appendix I, § ii. *CGVbMt* corrupt it to *prasahya hy avanīm nṛpaḥ*;

Devabhūmim ath=ōtsādyā³Śauṅgas⁶ tu⁷ bhavitā nṛpaḥbhaviṣyati samā⁹ rājā nava¹⁰ Kāṇvāyano¹¹ dvijāḥ¹²Bhūmimitraḥ¹³ sutas tasya¹⁴ caturdaśa¹⁵ bhaviṣyatiNārāyaṇaḥ¹⁶ sutas tasya¹⁷

bhavitā dvādaśaiva tu

Suśarmā¹⁹ tat-sutaś²⁰ c=āpi bhaviṣyati daśaiva tu²¹ity²² ete Śuṅga-bhṛtyās²³ tusmṛtāḥ²⁶ Kāṇvāyanā²⁷ nṛpāḥDevabhūmim⁴ tath=ōtpātya⁵Śuṅgeṣu⁸ bhavitā nṛpaḥbhavitā dvādaśa samās¹⁸

tasmān Nārāyaṇo nṛpaḥ

catvāras²⁴ Tuṅga-kṛtyās²⁵ tenṛpāḥ Kāṇvāyanā²⁸ dvijāḥ

and a²djmMt amend it to *prasahya vyasan-
aturam*. The expression *vyasanū nṛpaḥ*
occurs in AVā 88, 122.

³ So Mt genly: cMt Pkt *ath=ōchādyā*;
fjMt *tat=ōtsādyā*.

⁴ So Bd. Vā °bhūmī wrongly: bVā *Deva-
bhūmī[samādeśūdeśete]*. See p. 32, note ⁴⁵.

⁵ So a¹a⁴Vā: fjmVā *tat=ōtpātya*; kVā
†*tathānṛpāya*; dVā *tathonyadya*, bVā °nya-
dhā; Vā genly *tato 'nyas ca*. But eVā *ath=*
ōddhṛtya or °*dhatya*. Bd *tato hatvā*.

⁶ So A CdmMt: jMt *Soṅgas*; kMt *Śuṅgaḥ*;
cfjMt *Suṅgaḥ*; eMt *Sugaḥ*; eVā *Śubhaḥ*;
bMt *Saurāḥ*: nMt *Śuṅgam*.

⁷ In bceknMt, eVā *sa*; fjMt *saṁ*.

⁸ So a¹mVā, Bd. Vā genly *Śrñ°*; fVā
Muñ°.

⁹ Altered in dVā to *hanisyati sa vai*. This
line occurs previously in Mt, see p. 21,
note ²⁴: jMt there *daśa ṣaṭ ca samā*, here
dvijo daśa samā; kMt there has this half
line, *catvāriṁśat samā rājyaṁ*.

¹⁰ So Mt, Vā: bMt *aṁva* here, but *nava*
earlier. Bd *pañca*.

¹¹ So Mt genly here and in the earlier
passage. Bd, nMt *Kaṇ°*. Corruptions are
many, as eMt *Kāṁvāyata*; kMt *Kāmpāyana*,
Kaṇthā°; lMt *Kaṇthāyana*, *Kaṁmā°*; fjMt
Kāṣṭhāyana, *Kāṣṭā°*; dMt *Kāsvāyate*; bMt
Kācāyate. Vā genly, cMt *Kaṇthāyana*;
dVā *Kaṇṭā°*; bVā *Kaṁtapanu*; eVā *Kaṇthā-
mana*; kVā *Kaṇcāyana*; fmVā and 2 MSS
of CVā *Kāṇḍāyana*; &c. Vṣ, Bh *Kaṇva*,
see note ¹.

¹² So a¹a³cjklMt; bdfjMt *dvijāḥ*: other
Mt *nṛpāḥ* redundantly, and so all Mt in
earlier passage. Vā, Bd *tu saḥ*. Vṣ, Bh
svayam.

¹³ So Mt genly, Bd, Vṣ. This line occurs
previously in Mt, see p. 21, note ²⁴; where
cMt *Bhūmiputraḥ*, eMt °*putraṁ*. Vā, nMt
Bhūmimitraḥ. Bh, abVṣ *Bhūmitra*; cBh
Bhūrm°: lVṣ *Bhūmiputra*.

¹⁴ In nMt *sutasya*; mMt *tutasya*. Vṣ
adds *tat=putro*; Bh *tasya putras*.

¹⁵ So Mt. Vā, Bd *catur-vimśat*.

¹⁶ CMT *Nārāthanaḥ*; nMt *Nārāyaṇa*.
Vṣ, Bh agree; gBh *Pārāy°*.

¹⁷ So Bh *tasya sutāḥ*.

¹⁸ So bdfmVā, Bd. Vā genly Pkt *samā*.

¹⁹ So Mt genly, Vā, Bd. Vṣ agrees: cVṣ
Susarman; dVā *Susāmmatiḥ*; eVā *Sudharmā*.
Bh omits him, but gBh has preserved him
thus (also mentioned as v.r. in GBh)—

*Pārāyaṇasya bhavitā Suśarmā nāma
vīśrutāḥ*.

²⁰ In lVṣ *tasy=ātmajaḥ*; kVṣ *Nārāyaṇasy-
ānujaḥ*.

²¹ So Mt. Vā *samā daśa*. Bd *catuḥ-
samāḥ*.

²² In bMt *ya*.

²³ So Mt genly: kMt *Śrñ°*; cfjMt *Suñ°*;
lMt *Suga°*; jMt *Cāṅga°* or c¹āṅga° (see
p. 32, note ⁴⁷); bMt *Muṅgaṇṛtyās*; eMt
Bhūṅgaratyās (omitting *tu*).

²⁴ So eVā. Vā genly *caturas*: see Appendix
I, § iv.

²⁵ So Vā genly; lVā °*kṛ[teā]tyās*; dVā
°*lāṁtyās*: eVā nearly correctly *Śuṅga-
ṛtyās*: see Appendix II, § iii. For Bd,
Vṣ, Bh see note ⁴².

²⁶ In eMt *smutuḥ*; mMt *sthitāḥ*.

²⁷ With variations (see note ¹¹), as eMt
Kaṁjāy°; lMt *Kagvayata*.

²⁸ Amended. Vā *Kaṇthāyanā* with vv. rr.

catvāras tu ²⁹ dvijā hy ete ³⁰

Kaṇvā ³¹ bhokṣyanti vai ³² mahīm
catvāriṁśat pañca ³³ cāiva ³⁴

bhokṣyantīmān vasundharām
ete ³⁵ praṇata-sāmantā

bhaviṣyā dhārmikāś ca ye
yeśām ³⁶ paryāya ³⁷-kāle tu ³⁸

bhumir Āndhrān gamiṣyati ⁴⁰.

bhāvyāḥ praṇata-sāmantāś
catvāriṁśac ca pañca ca

teśām paryāya-kāle tu ³⁹

bhūr Andhrānām ⁴¹ bhaviṣyati ⁴².

10

Andhras.

Text—AMt 273, 1-17^a; AVā 99, 348-358^a; Bḍ iii, 74, 160^b-170.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 12-13; GBh xii, 1, 22-28.

This dynasty is given in full by the Matsya, while the accounts in the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa are far from perfect. The Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu give a list of the kings though not completely, with some details at the beginning and end.

The defects in the MSS will appear from the following notices of the kings; but eVā, which stands midway between the Matsya and Vāyu, has misplaced the first portion down to Svāti, inserting it long afterwards, out of place, after the first line about Viśvasphāni: *hpMt* have nothing; *hVā* omits ll. 1-21.

²⁹ So *jMt*. *Mt* genly *catvāriṁśat*; *bdnMt* °śa: see Appendix I, § iv.

³⁰ But *jMt* omits *hy*; *nMt* omits *hy ete*: *bMt* cite (for *c-aite*).

³¹ So *Mt* genly: *CfymMt* Kāṇvā; *nMt* Kaṇvo; *eMt* Kāro; *lMt* Kageo.

³² In *lMt* *erp*: *jMt* reads this half line, *bhokṣyante prthivīm imām*.

³³ So *Mt* genly: *bMt* °riṁśa naghatm (or *nadyam*).

³⁴ In *jMt* *c-aite*.

³⁵ So *Mt* genly: *jMt* *gate*.

³⁶ In *bedefjghMt* *teśām*.

³⁷ In *lMt* *payoja*.

³⁸ So *Mt* genly: *eMt* *kāleṣu*.

³⁹ So *Vā* genly: *CIVā* *kāleṣu*, *bdVā* *kal°*.

⁴⁰ So *Mt* genly: *fMt* *An°*: *gMt* *Andhrām*, *eMt* °rā. This half line is in *a²bnMt* *bhūmir* (*n*, *mūmir*) *iddhā bhaviṣyati*; *lMt* *mūmir i bh°* (short); *jMt* *bhūmih sāmdrā* (for *s-Āndhrā*) *bh°*.

⁴¹ All *Vā* readings are *erp*, and this is an emendation. *Bhūr* is represented thus,

a³a⁴Vā tur; *Ca²gghlVā tar*; *a¹Vā ter*; *fmVā star*; *bdVā ster* (altered to *ter* in *d*). *An-dhrānām*, or rather its Pkt form *Andhrāna*, is represented thus, *a¹fmVā Andhrā nu*; *a²a¹bdVā Andhā nu*; *Ca²ghlVā Andhā tu*. But *eVā* has *Mt* reading *erp*, *bhumir-antān gamiṣyati*.

⁴² *Bḍ* and *Bh* have not got the concluding lines (5 in *Mt*, 3 in *Vā*). *Bḍ* has—

Kāṇvāyanāś tu catvāraś catvāriṁśac ca pañca ca
samā bhokṣyanti prthivīm punar Andhrān gamiṣyati.

Bh similarly—

Kāṇvāyanā * ime bhūmim catvāriṁśac ca pañca ca
śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyanti varṣāṇām¹ ca Kalau yuge:

where **j*l*Bh* *Kaṇ°*; **qBh* *varṣāni*. *Vṣ* says—
ete Kāṇvāyanāś* catvāraḥ pañca-catvāriṁśad-varṣāni bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti:
where **eVṣ* *Kaṇv°*, *kVṣ* *Kāśv°*.

The Vāyu, Brahmanḍa, Bhāgavata, and Viṣṇu all say there were 30 kings, though they do not give 30 names. The Vā MSS name only 17, 18, or 19, and *eVā* which is the fullest names only 25; Brahmanḍa only 17; Bhāgavata 23; and Viṣṇu 24, or 22 and 23 in two MSS. The Matsya says there were 19 kings, but 3 MSS (*dgn*) actually name 30, and the others vary from 28 to 21. Before noticing the differences in them and the other authorities, it will be convenient to set out the list of the kings, of whom 30 are clearly named; and 30 is no doubt the correct number.

1 Simuka	11 Skandasvāti	21 Cakora
2 Kṛṣṇa	12 Mrgendra	22 Śivasvāti
3 Śrī-Śātakarṇi (Śrī-Mallak ^o)	13 Kuntala	23 Gautamīputra
4 Pūrṇotsaṅga	14 Svātivarna	24 Pulomā
5 Skandhastambhi	15 Pulomāvi (Padumān)	[24a Śātakarṇi]
6 Śātakarṇi	16 Ariṣṭakarna	25 Śivaśrī
7 Lambodara	17 Hāla	26 Śivaskandha
8 Āpilaka (Divilaka)	18 Mantalaka or Pattalaka	27 Yajñaśrī
9 Meghasvāti	19 Purindrasena	28 Vijaya
10 Svāti	20 Sundara Śātakarṇi	29 Candāśrī
		30 Pulomāvi

The lists in the MSS stand thus, omitting at present no. 24a who is mentioned only in *eVā*. Mt MSS name the following (*fym* Mt calling no. 15 Pulomāvi a second Meghasvāti), the numbers within brackets denoting those who are omitted:—*CGV* have 27 kings (nos. 2, 5, 15 omitted); *a*¹*a*²*a*³*a*⁴ 28 (5, 15); *b* 27 (9, 20, 22); *c* 27 (2, 5, 20); *e* 25 (2, 5, 20, 23, 24); *f* 27 (24, 25, 29); *j* 24 (5, 7, 8, 18, 19, 29); *k* 21 (5, 9-11, 20-23, 29); *l* 20 (2, 5, 9, 12, 13, 20-24); *m* 27 (1, 2, 5); *n* 29 (20); *d* 30, and repeats 6-10; *g* 30, and repeats 10-14 and 15 (with correct name Pulomāvi); *hp* Mt have nothing. All Vā MSS, other than *eVā*, name nos. 1-3, 6-8, 15-23, 27-30; except that *Ca*²*a*³*f* omit no. 21; *k* no. 8; *l* 8, 21; *m* 21, 30; *k* has lost the first part and begins with no. 19: *a*¹*a*⁴ apparently insert no. 8 twice; *m* repeats 3, 6 after no. 8. All these Vā name no. 20 Sundara merely as Śātakarṇi.

But *eVā* is peculiar and its list is broken up into three sets. It begins thus, nos. 11, 18, 19, 20 (calling him Sundara), 21; then reverting mentions 12-15, 24a, 25-30; and long afterwards (see p. 35) names 1-4, 6-10 (corrupting no. 9's name). It thus omits 5, 16, 17, 22-24, yet makes its total 25 by including 24a, who is considered further on.

Bd names 1-3, 6, 8, 15-20, 22, 23, 27-30. Vṣ mentions 1-4, 6-9, 15-30; but *bVṣ* omits 4, 6; *kVṣ* no. 21; *lVṣ*, 28, 29. Bh names 1-4, 7-9, 15-20; but *lBh* have nothing.

All the authorities keep the order of the kings as in the above list, except that 5 Mt MSS show three discrepancies. Two are small, namely, (1) *d* Mt mentions 6-10 and immediately repeats them; (2) *n* Mt inverts nos. 5 and 6, and mentions no. 19 twice, first after no. 13 and again in his proper place. The third discrepancy concerns nos. 10-15: *g* Mt names these in their place and repeats them after no. 29; and *b* Mt omit them from their place and insert them (*l* omitting 12, 13) after no. 29. These discrepancies appear to be mere mistakes due to carelessness, or to lacunae or disarrangements of leaves in the MSS copied.

Every king in the list (except 24a) is mentioned by most of the MSS of at least two Purāṇas, except nos. 5, 10-14. No. 5 occurs only in Mt, but 5 MSS name him. Nos. 10-14 are mentioned only by Mt and *eVā*; but no. 14 appears in

them all ; nos. 10, 11 in all except *AMt* ; and nos. 12, 13 in all except *AMt*. They seem to be genuine, and help to constitute the total number 30. The general consensus then establishes the number, names, and order in the above list.

No. 24a, Śātakarṇi, mentioned only in *eVā*, is not no. 20, who is called Śātakarṇi merely in all other *Vā* MSS and in *Bd*, for *Mt*, *Vā*, *Bd*, and *eVā* agree that the latter reigned only one year (p. 41, l. 23), while the description of the former in *eVā* is l. 28 on p. 42, and assigns 29 years to him. There is no line like it except l. 32 about Yajñaśrī, but he is not apparently Yajñaśrī whom *eVā* mentions in his proper place. According to the *eVā* list he should come presumably either immediately after no. 15, or immediately before no. 25 Śivaśrī. The only indication I can find bearing upon this puzzle occurs in *IVs*, which regards Śātakarṇi Śivaśrī as two, (1) Śātakarṇi, (2) Śivaśrī (see p. 42, note 1), and so places a Śātakarṇi exactly in one of the two positions required by *eVā*. If this Śātakarṇi then be real, his place would be 24a. A line found in only one MS should not be rejected straight away (see *Introdn.* § 31), hence I have included him in the list in that position by l. 28 ; but, since his existence is vouched for by no other authority and he would raise the number of the kings to 31, that line is enclosed in brackets. If he is genuine, we may suppose that the total 30 is a round number.

Many of the kings bore the name Śātakarṇi, and it is spelt in many ways, the first part as *Śāti*, *Śīnta*, *Śānti*, *Śita* (with *s* often instead of *ś* in these forms), and the latter part as *karṇi*, *karṇa*, *koṇa*, *varṇa*, &c. It is needless to state all such variations in the text and notes, and the form *Śātakarṇi* is adopted because it agrees best with the *Pkt* form *Sātakani* generally found on coins. The names *Śrāṭikarṇa* and *Śvātivarṇa* occur sometimes and seem to be merely variants of it (see notes ⁶⁷, ⁶¹, ⁶⁵). All these forms may obviously be Sanskritizations of that one *Pkt* name.

Prof. Rapson's 'Indian Coins, Andhras, &c.' elucidate this dynasty partially. I have not attempted, as it is not my function here, to identify the names in this list with those mentioned in inscriptions and on coins, except those of the first three kings who seem clear. The first king, whose correct name was Simuka Sātavāhana, is mentioned in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, no. 1113 (*Epig. Ind.* x, Appendix) ; the second Kṛṣṇa or Kunba in *id.* no. 1144 ; and the third Śrī-Śātakarṇi in *id.* nos. 346, 1114. In other inscriptions the following kings are mentioned—Gotamīputa Siri Sātakani, nos. 1123, 1125 ; Siri Sivamaka Sada, no. 1279 ; Sati (= Śakti ?) Sirimata, no. 1112 ; Vāsithīputa Siri Pulumāvi, nos. 1106, 1124 (and probably 1100) ; Siri Pulumāvi, no. 1248 ; Vāsithīputa Siri Pulumāvi, nos. 1122-3 ; Vāsathīputa Catarapana Satakani, no. 1120 ; Gotamīputa Siri Sātakani, no. 1123, and Sadakani, no. 1125 ; Sivakhada (or Sadakhada) Nāga siri, no. 1186 ; Gotamīputa Siri Yaṇa, nos. 987, 1024, 1146, 1340 ; Vāsithīputa Caḍasāta, no. 1341 ; and Mūḍhariputa Sirivira Purisadata of the Ikṣvākus, nos. 1202-4 (see note ⁷⁸).

It may be noted that one line in certain *Mt* MSS differs from all the others in its expression, namely, l. 30 about Yajñaśrī (see note thereto). He is spoken of there in the present tense, *kurute* : see *Introdn.* § 21, note.

The total of the individual reigns (excluding no. 24a) is only 442½ years, even if we take the longest periods wherever there is a difference ; but the whole duration is said to have been 460 years in *Mt*, 411 in *Vā*, and 456 in *Bd*, *Vs*, and *Bh*. The addition of no. 24a would increase the first total.

Kāṇvāyanāms¹ tato bhṛtyāḥ²

Suśarmāṇaḥ⁵ prasahya⁶ tam⁷

Śuṅgānām⁹ c=aiṇa yac cheṣam¹⁰

kṣapitvā tu¹³ baliyasah¹⁴

Śisūko 'ndhraḥ¹⁷ sa-jātīyah¹⁸

prāpsyat=imām vasundharām

trayo-vimśat²⁰ samā rājā Simukas²¹ tu bhaviṣyati²²

¹ This line is in Mt. This name is often corrupted as in p. 34, note¹¹; and first vowel is long or short. In nMt °yanāms; fMt °yanī; Mt genly °yanāḥ, which should be °yanāms, as the accus. is required.

² So dfykMt; bMt tadā°: jMt tato bhṛtyān. Mt genly tato bhūpāḥ. But eMt tadodhṛtya; eMt tad-ōddhṛtya; so nMt erp. Bhṛtyāḥ is prob. correct, cf. Vṣ, Bh; the plural here may refer to 'Simuka and his fellow-tribesmen' in l. 3. Vṣ says—

Suśarmāṇam Kāṇvam* ca bhṛtyo[†] balāt[‡] Śīpraka[†]-nāmā hatvā^{||} Andhra^{||}-jātīyo vasudhām bhokṣyati:

where *kVṣ Kāṇvam, bVṣ Kāṇvāyanam; †aVṣ sa-bhṛtyam, jVṣ sra-bhṛtyo, bVṣ sad-bhṛtya-, kVṣ sa bhṛtyam; ‡aVṣ balat, bVṣ balaṁ, lVṣ vali, jVṣ balavān, kVṣ valākṣi; †bVṣ Chiptaka, aVṣ Śivika, kVṣ Pulaka, lVṣ Pucchaka; || bVṣ hatva-r; || lVṣ Andha, bVṣ Am[ṛ]tyam]pra, kVṣ hy Andha, jVṣ Sudhra. Bh says—

hatvā Kāṇvam* Suśarmāṇam tad-bhṛtyo[†] vṛṣalo bali[‡]

gām bhokṣyaty Andhra^{||}-jātīyah^{||} kañcit ||
kālam a-sattamaḥ:

where *rBh Kāṇvam; †kBh tadratyō; ‡fBh vṛṣabho° (f strictly vṛṣabhordhalī, cf. p. 25, note⁷); †dVh Andhri, fBh anyā; || cBh kañcit.

³ This line in Vā, Bḍ. Bḍ Kāṇv°. Vā genly Kāṇh°: other variations similar to those in p. 34, note¹¹. Bḍ, Ca²a⁴eVā °yanam; a²a⁴bdfykM Vā °yanān.

⁴ So Ca²a⁴eVā, Bḍ: a²a⁴kVā atoḥd° or atōddhṛtya; fgmVā ato dhṛtya; dVā tatōddhṛtya (Pkt).

⁵ In jMt °neḥ; benMt °ṇam; lMt °ṇa; gMt °sarmāṇam.

⁶ In a²nMt pragṛhya.

⁷ CbḍjMt tām; gMt tām; fMt tvām.

Kāṇvāyanam³ ath-ōddhṛtya⁴

Suśarmāṇam prasahya tam⁸

Śuṅgānām¹¹ c=āpi yac chiṣtam¹²

kṣapayitvā¹⁵ balaṁ tadā¹⁶

Sindhuko hy Andhra-jātīyah¹⁹

prāpsyat=imām vasundharām

tu bhaviṣyati²²

⁸ In eVā Sudharmāṇam prasahyataḥ.

⁹ So Mt; bMt Sumnānām; ceknMt sutā°; jMt Aṁgārā.

¹⁰ In eMt c=aiṇa dṛṣam; fMt c=aiṇa sarveṣām.

¹¹ This line is in Vā, not in Bḍ. Ca²a²Vā Śṛṅg°.

¹² In eVā yac cheṣaḥ; fmVā defective.

¹³ So Mt mostly: dMt kṣayitvā sa; ceMt kṣipitvā sa; lMt jṛyitvā tu: fgmMt kṣapayitvā, jMt kṣep°, bMt kṛp°.

¹⁴ In eMt balāyasaḥ; jMt mahīyasām.

¹⁵ CVā kṣayayitvā.

¹⁶ In eVā bali tathā, dVā °tadā.

¹⁷ So Mt genly; dMt °dhrah; jMt °dhra; nMt °dhra; kMt °va; bMt °yah: dMt Śisurko° here, Śisukas in next line; eMt Śisruk-Āndhraḥ; fgmMt Śikhukas tu; lMt Kimśukerodhaḥ. The correct name is Simuka (Rapson, 'Indian Coins, Andhras, &c.' pp. xviii, xlvii). It was misread as Sisuka, and then Sktzd (1) as Śisuka, and (2) as Śisuka whence Śikhuka, by dialectical variation of ṣ and kh. Simuka could be misread as Śīpraka which Vṣ has, see note².

¹⁸ In kMt śa-jāt°.

¹⁹ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā Chismako hy² a-jātīyah.

²⁰ So CdfjMt, Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly °vimsa: eVā reads this line—

sa trayo-vimśati rājā bhavitā Chismakāḥ samāḥ

²¹ I put the correct name here to combine Mt, Vā, Bḍ, which read it as above: eMt Śisrukās; eMt Śimśukah.

²² So Mt. Vā, Bḍ bhavitā tv atha; dVā omits tv; mVā °tv a[ṛku]tham; gVā bhavitā[s] tathā.

Kṛṣṇo²³ bhrātā yaviyāms tu²⁴
aṣṭādaśa²⁷ bhaviṣyati

Śrī-Śātakarnīr²⁹ bhavitā tasya putras³⁰ tu vai daśa³¹

Pūrṇotsaṅgas³² tato³³ rājā varṣāny³⁴ aṣṭādaśaiva tu

Skandhastambhis³⁵ tathā³⁶ rājā varṣāny³⁷ aṣṭādaśaiva tu

pañcāśatam³⁸ samāḥ ṣaṭ ca³⁹ Śātakarnīr⁴⁰ bhaviṣyati

daśa ca⁴¹ aṣṭau ca⁴² varṣāni tasya⁴³ Lambodarah⁴³ sutaḥ⁴⁴

Āpilako⁴⁵ daśa dve ca⁴⁶ tasya putro bhaviṣyati

²³ Mt genly the Pkt nomin. form *Kṛṣṇa*; jMt *Kṛṣṇā*. Vṣ says—*Kṛṣṇa-nāmā tad-bhrātā*. Bh says—

Kṛṣṇa-nām-ātha tad-bhrātā bhavitā prthi-vi-patiḥ.

See Rapson, *op. cit.*, pp. xix, xlii.

²⁴ In fJMt *ca*.

²⁵ So *a¹a²dgVā*, Bḍ: *eVā Kṛṣṇā*; *bVā kṛpau*; *a²Vā Teasṭro*; *fJmVā Teasṭro*; *CjklVā aṣṭau*.

²⁶ So *bdeVā*, Bḍ: *a¹ fJgkmVā*, 3 MSS of *CVā bhrātasya*; *lVā*, 2 MSS of *CVā bhrātāś ca*; 1 MS of *CVā smātasya*.

²⁷ So all Mt; but nMt *aṣṭām daśa*, see Introdn. § 40.

²⁸ So *a² bdfgkmVā*, Bḍ: *lVā so smā d^o*; *eVā so 'ṣṭād^o*; *Ca¹jVā tasmād d^o*; see Introdn. § 40.

²⁹ This name is spelt variously, see p. 37. *Vā* genly *°Śātakarnīr*. Bḍ, Vṣ *°Śāntakarnīr*. But *bdeMt °Mālakarnī*, nMt *°kanī* (easy misreadings); Mt genly *°Mallakarnī*; jMt *°Śālakarnīr*, kMt *°parṇi*. Bh *°Śāntakarnā*, fBh *°varna*.

³⁰ Bh, lVṣ agree, *tasya putras*: fJjMt *putrās*.

³¹ So Mt genly; *bceknMt samāḥ*. *Vā*, Bḍ *mahān*.

³² This line is only in Mt, *eVā*. So Mt genly; fMt *Pūrṇotsarga*; cMt *Pūrṇāsaṅgas*, eMt *°sugas*; *eVā* reads this line—

Pūrṇosantu ca varṣāni bhavit-āṣṭādaśaiva tu.

Vṣ *Pūrṇotsaṅga*; jVṣ *°sam[mṛ]ga*; hVṣ *Pūrṇesaṅga*; lVṣ *Vasukarnṇotsaṅga*. Bh *Paurṇamāsa*, and adds *tat-sutaḥ*.

³³ *Tu vai* in *beenMt*.

³⁴ *Samā* in nMt.

³⁵ This line is only in *bdfjnMt*. So fJMt; dMt *°stabhis*; bMt *Svīrasvanis* (an easy

Kṛṣṇo²⁵ bhrātāśya²⁶ varṣāni
so 'smād daśa²⁸ bhaviṣyati

5

misreading); nMt *°Svāstuti*, and inverts him and the next king.

³⁶ *Tapā* in nMt.

³⁷ *Samā* in nMt.

³⁸ So *Vā*, *CedennMt*; jMt *°satāḥ*. Bḍ, fJjMt *°sat tu*; *AklMt °sac ca*.

³⁹ *Ṣaṭ kar* in *eVā*; eMt *ṣadu*; nMt omits *ca*.

⁴⁰ No marked variations in this name: nMt inverts him and the preceding king; mVā repeating the line reads *tasya putro*. Bh omits him.

⁴¹ *Daśa vāsaiva* in bMt.

⁴² In *eVā* [*bharitā*] *tasmāl*.

⁴³ This line only in Mt and *eVā*. Bh and Vṣ agree in the name.

⁴⁴ Bh agrees, *tat-putras*: *eVā nṛpaḥ*.

⁴⁵ Mt genly *Āpitako*; cfJMt *Āpūt^o*; eMt *Āpūt^o*; nMt *Āpūt^o* or *Āpūt^o*; bMt *†Aryāntako*: *eVā Āpūloko*. But *gVā Āpūlavā*; fVā, 3 MSS of *CVā Āpūt^o*; jVā *Āpūt^o*; 1 MS of *CVā Āpūt^o*; mVā *Ārpūt^o* or *Āryūt^o*; *a¹⁻⁴Vā*, 2 MSS of *CVā Āpūdabā*; *bḍVā Āpistavā*. Bḍ *Āpolavo*. *Āpūlaka* seems the best form: the third syll. *ta* in Mt names may be a misreading of *ta*, and may be read either way in nMt. Vṣ genly reads *tasmād* before this name, and it was apptly often read as Pkt *tasmā* with the final *d* applied to the name; thus lVṣ *Dāpīlaka* (though it interposes *ca*), and *cdekVṣ (tasmādivīlakah) Ivīl^o* or *Divīl^o*; hence *afgVṣ Divīl^o*, *CVṣ Divīl^o*: *hVṣ Divīla*; *jVṣ Vīla^o*; *bVṣ Divānika*. Bh genly (reading *d* in Gupta script as *c*) *Civilaka* or *Cibīl^o*, *aqBh °līka*; *fBh Cīlībika*, *dBh °bika*; *cBh Cīlīlīka*, *Vīcīlīka*; *rBh Vīvīlīka*, *hBh Yīl^o* or *Ghīl^o* and *Cīvīl^o*. BBh *Vīkala* apptly.

⁴⁶ So Mt; *cenMt tu*. *Vā* genly, Bḍ *dvādaśa vai*, which is equally good: *a¹⁻⁴Vā*, 2 MSS of *CVā †-ddhodaśa^o*.

daśa c-aṣṭau ca varṣāṇi Meghasvātir ⁴⁷ bhaviṣyati	
Svātis ca bhavitā ⁴⁸ rājā ⁴⁹	Ātir bhaviṣyati nrpo
samās ⁵⁰ tv aṣṭādaśaiva ⁵¹ tu	varṣāṇi dvādaśaiva tu ⁵²
Skandasvātis ⁵³ tathā rājā	Skandasvātīḥ samās tasmāt
sapt-aiva tu ⁵⁴ bhaviṣyati	sapta ⁵⁵ rājyaṁ kariṣyati
Mrgendraḥ ⁵⁶ Svātikarṇas ⁵⁷ tu ⁵⁸ bhaviṣyati samās trayah ⁵⁹	15
Kuntalaḥ ⁶⁰ Svātikarṇas ⁶¹ tu ⁶² bhavit-aṣṭau samā ⁶³ nrpaḥ	
eka-samvatsaraṁ ⁶⁴ rājā Svātivarno ⁶⁵ bhaviṣyati	
ṣaṭ-trimśad ⁶⁶ eva ⁶⁷ varṣāṇi	catur-vimśat ⁶⁸ tu varṣāṇi
Pulomāvir ⁶⁹ bhaviṣyati	Pulomāvir ⁶⁹ bhaviṣyati
bhavit-Āriṣṭakarṇas ⁷⁰ tu varṣāṇām pañca-vimśatiḥ ⁷¹	

⁴⁷ This line only in Mt, *eVā*. So Mt genly; *jMt* °*svāmī*; *CMt* *Medhasvātir*; *nMt* *Samghasvāpi*, an easy misreading; *ceMt* *Samghas c-aṣṭi*. *Vṣ*, *Bh* *Meghasvātī*, *jVṣ* *Maghas*°; *kVṣ* *Meghaghātī*. The name has been corrupted in *eVā* which reads—

daśa c-aṣṭau ca bhavitā so 'ṣṭādaśa bhaviṣyati.

⁴⁸ This line only in Mt: *bMt* *Svātir bhaviṣyate*, *nMt* *Svāmī bh*°; *gMt*, in repeating the line, *Svāmī bh*°: *ceMt* *sa eva bhokṣyate*.

⁴⁹ In *bMt* *ramyā*.

⁵⁰ In *celnMt* *samā*: *bMt* *manās*, so *gMt* in repeating.

⁵¹ In *cenMt* *aṣṭau daśa-iva* (omitting *tu*).

⁵² This line is in *eVā* only. *Introdn.* § 40.

⁵³ So Mt, mostly. *CMt* °*svātis* misprinted as °*racātis*: *benMt* and *gMt* (in repeating) *Skandhasvātis*, *dMt* °*svāmis*; *lMt* *Skam-rastrāṇis* (an easy misreading).

⁵⁴ Misread as *sam-aiva tva* in *gMt* (repeated), °*tvam* in *bMt*; *cenMt* *sapta c-aiva*.

⁵⁵ This line in *eVā* only; thus, *Skandasvātīḥ samās tasmā samā*, where *samā* is misreading for *sapta*.

⁵⁶ This line only in Mt, *eVā*: *bMt* *Bhagendraḥ*; *eVā* *Mahen*°; *jMt* *naren*°.

⁵⁷ So Mt genly: *fgMt* °*varṇas*, but *gMt* repeats as in text; *nMt* *Śātikarṇas*; *eVā* *Sātakarṇis*.

⁵⁸ In *eMt* *mu*: after this *nMt* adds by mistake and superfluously *varṣāṇi pañca-vimśati* (from l. 19).

⁵⁹ In *eVā* *samā-trayam*.

⁶⁰ This line only in Mt, *eVā*: *bMt* *Kuśalaḥ*; *jMt* *Kṣettulāḥ*.

⁶¹ In *nMt* *Śāntik*°; *eVā* *Sātakarṇis*.

⁶² *Ca* in *cefMt*, and *gMt* in repeating.

⁶³ In *jMt* °*aṣṭa samo*.

⁶⁴ But *benlMt* °*samvatsaro*, *eMt* °*śe v*°, *gMt* (in repeating) *śakasamv*°.

⁶⁵ This line only in Mt, *eVā*. So *ACldlMt*: *cejMt* °*karno*; *fgnMt* °*kono*, *gMt* (in repeating) °*varṇo*; *dMt* °*keno*; *eVā* °*ṣeno*; *kMt* *Syātisen*°; *nMt* *Śātikarno*.

⁶⁶ This line is in Mt, except *ACMt*: *lmMt* *ṣaṭ-trimśad*; *gMt* (in repeating) *ṣaḍ-vimśad*; *nMt* *ṣaḍgimśa* (= *ṣaḍ-vimśa*).

⁶⁷ So *dmMt* and *gMt* (in repeating): *lMt* *deva*; *jkMt* *c-aiva*; *cenMt* *tv eva*; *bfgMt* *dve ca*.

⁶⁸ So *Vā*, *Bd*: *eVā* °*trimśat*.

⁶⁹ This name has been greatly corrupted. So *belnMt*; *gMt* (in repeating) °*vi*: *ceMt* *Pulomāvid*; *jMt* *Sulomāvir* (an easy misreading). In *Vā*: *dgkVā* *Padumāvir* (or, as it may be read in *dgVā*, *Yadu*°; and so *a²a¹Vā* and 3 MSS of *CVā*): then by easy misreadings, *bVā* *Paṭu*° (or *Ya*°); *eVā* *Patra-mātir* (or *Ya*°); *fVā* *Ṣaṭumāvir*; 4 MSS of *CVā* *Ṣaḍu*°; *nVā* *Ṣaṭu*° or *Ṣadu*°; *jVā* *Ṣaḍrarmāvi*; *a¹Vā* and 2 MSS of *CVā* *ṣaṭ samā vai* (by attempt at emendment). By regarding the final *vi* (in *Pkt*) as an expletive (= *vai* or *api*), *hjVṣ* *Padumān* or *Paṭu*°; *abedegklVṣ* *Paṭu*°; *Bd* *Paṭumāṇis ca*; other *Vṣ* *Paḍhumān*. Then *arBh* *Ṣaṭamāna*; *Bh* genly *Āṭa*°; *nBh* *Āṭha*°; *mBh* *Amḍa*°; *dBh* *Ara*°; *sBh* *Raca*°. For this name *fmMt* substitute (a second) *Meghasvātir*; and *gMt* *Bhegha*°.

⁷⁰ There is great variation in this name

tataḥ saṁvatsarān pañca ⁷² Hālo ⁷³ rājā bhaviṣyati	25
pañca Mantalako ⁷⁴ rājā ⁷⁵	pañca Pattalako ⁷⁴ rājā ⁷⁶
bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ ⁷⁷	bhaviṣyati mahābalaḥ ⁷⁸
Purīndraseno ⁷⁹ bhavitā	bhāvyaḥ Purikaṣeṇas ⁸⁰ tu
tasmāt saumyo bhaviṣyati ⁸¹	samāḥ so 'py eka-vimśatim ⁸²
Sundaraḥ ⁸³ Śātakarṇis ⁸⁴ tu	Śātakarṇir ⁸⁵ varṣam ekam
abdam ⁸⁶ ekam bhaviṣyati	bhaviṣyati narādhipaḥ
Cakoraḥ ⁸⁷ Śātakarṇis ⁸⁸ tu saṁ māsān ⁸⁹ vai bhaviṣyati ⁹⁰	

Vā genly *bhavitā Nemikṣṇas*; *dVā °Nemikṣmas*; *nMt °Navikṣṇas*; *dMt °Naurik°*; *jMt °Nārik°*; *kMt °Saurik°*; *fgMt °staurik°*; *eMt °Gaurak°*; *cMt °Gaurakṣṇas*. *ACMt bhavit-Āriktavarṇas*; *bMt °Āriktakarṇas*; *nMt °Āriktakarṇis*. *Vs Ariṣṭakarmā*; so *aBh*. Bḍ *bhavit-Āriṣṭakarmā*. *Bh Ariṣṭakarmā*. It is impossible to extract the correct name out of this confusion, and I have adopted *Ariṣṭakarmā* as the most central form.

⁷¹ So *a'ā'ablfyVā*: Vā genly, *bMt*, Bḍ *°tim*. *Mt varṣāni . . . tiḥ*; *jMt* reads this half line, *saṁ-māsān vai bhaviṣyati*.

⁷² So *Mt*. Vā, Bḍ *saṁvatsaram pūṛṇam*.

⁷³ So all, except *IVs Hala*; *Bh Hāleya*; *rBh Hālela* or *Hālena*; *cBh Hālaya*.

⁷⁴ There is great variation in this name. *ACbMt Mandulako*; *cMt Mantalako*, *eMt °tanako*; *lMt Menulake*; *fyknMt Maṇḍalako*; *dMt Maṇḍako*; *nMt Kuṇḍalako*. Then *kVs Puntalaka* or *Putl°*; *Vs* genly *Putl°*; *IVs Pūt°*; *deVs Putl°*; *jVs Pakṣal°*; *aVs Prabhu°* (or *Prattal°*?). Bḍ *Pattallaka*. *Bh*, losing the first syll., *Talaka* (see Appendix II, § vi); *aBh Tanaka*; *hBh Halaka*; *dBh Śūl°*. Vā, by losing the third syllable, *Saptaka*; *fVā Saptanaka*; *bdVā Masaka* (misreading of *Maṇṭaka*?). *eVā* reads this half line, *pañc-aicabhā . . ko rājā*. *Mantalaka* or *Pattalaka* seems the most likely form, from which the other readings might have been derived by misreadings. *Bh* says, *tasya c-ātmajāḥ*.

⁷⁵ So *Mt*, *eVā*: *bMt rākṣo*.

⁷⁶ Vā, to compensate for the lost syllable in *Saptaka*, and by the meaning of *sapta*, reads *rājāno* and turns the two following words into plurals: *mVā rānā[mam]no*. Bḍ *nāma*. The correct reading must be *rājā*.

⁷⁷ So *Mt*, *eVā*, where *nṛpaḥ* is redundant, cf. line 26.

⁷⁸ So Bḍ. Vā *°gyanti mahābalaḥ*.

⁷⁹ This line is in *Mt*. So *Mt* genly; *CMt °seno* or *°senū*; *nMt Purīndraseno* and *Purīndra°*; *bMt Purānda°*; *hVs Pulīndrasana* (for *°drasena*); *abkVs °dasena*; *IVs Pullas°*; *Vs* genly, *eVā Pravīllas°*; *deVs Pravīllas°*; *jMt Pravīllis°*; where *pra* may be a misreading of *pu*.

⁸⁰ This line is in Vā, Bḍ. So *a'°fjlmVā*; *bdVā Purikaseṇas*; *kVā Purikāṣeṇas*; *jVā Purikheṇis*; *CVā Putrikaseṇas*. Then *dBh Purīṣaseru* (where *s* and *bh* are much alike); *arsBh °bheru*; *eghjklmnpqBh °bhoru*; other *Bh*, Bḍ *°bhīru*. These variations suggest the name *Purīṣaseru*. A king *Purīṣadata* of the *Ikhākus* is mentioned, see p. 37.

⁸¹ So *Mt* genly: *bMt sāmyo°*; *nMt saumyo°*, *°yan°*; *dMt seno°*. *Saumyo* cannot well be a king, though the line says so on its face, because in this dynasty two kings are never put together in a single line without any mention of their reigns. *Saumyo bhaviṣyati* is probably a corruption, see Appendix II, § iii.

⁸² So *Ca'ffjkmVā*, Bḍ; *a'ā'abdhVā °tiḥ*; *gVā °ti*: *eVā* reads this half line *sumā dvādasa bhū-tule*.

⁸³ This line is in *Mt*, *eVā*. *Vs Sundura*: *fgMt Sundharah*. *Bh*, *IVs Sunandana*.

⁸⁴ Usual variations, see p. 37.

⁸⁵ So Vā, Bḍ, with variations, but no personal name: 1 MS of *CVā Śāntakīrttir*.

⁸⁶ In *eVā varṣam*; *jMt . . tam*.

⁸⁷ So *Mt* genly, *eVā*. Vā genly *Cakāra*. *Vs*, *Bh Cakora*; *gpBh Cakara*; *hVs Cā[kā]-kāra*. But *ceMt Rājāda*; *nMt rājā vai*: *bMt* reads this half line *rājā ramīṣyo vikarṇas ca*: *IVs* merely *Śātakarṇi*.

aṣṭā-vimśati ⁹¹ varṣāṇi Śivasvātir ⁹² bhaviṣyati

25

rājā ca Gautamīputra ⁹³ eka-vimśat tato ⁹⁴ nṛpaḥ ⁹⁵

aṣṭā-vimśaḥ ⁹⁶ sutas ⁹⁷ tasya Pulomā vai ⁹⁸ bhaviṣyati

[ek-ōṇa-trimśatim bhāvyah Śātakarṇis tatho nṛpaḥ] ⁹⁹

Śivaśrīr ¹ vai Pulomā tu ² sapt-aiwa ³ bhavitā nṛpaḥ ⁴

Śivaskandhaḥ ⁵ Śātakarṇir ⁶ bhavit-asyātmajaḥ samāḥ ⁷

30

nava-vimśati ⁸ varṣāṇi

Yajñaśrīḥ ¹⁰ Śātakarṇikah ¹¹

ek-ōṇa-vimśatim ⁹ rājā

Yajñaśrīḥ ¹² Śātakarṇy atha ¹³

⁹⁸ So Vā, cdefjgnMt, Vṣ, with variations. Mt genly *Svātīkarnas*. Instead of this name Bh genly *vaṭako yatra*; cBh *vaṭikā*; nBh (and BBh?) *navamo*; jBh *carako* altered to *vaṭako*; GgBh *bahavo*; dBh *baṭako* (or *ṣaṭako*) *yasya*. Read *vaṭuko yasya*?

⁹⁹ In bdeMt *māso*; eVā *ṣaṭ samān*.

⁹⁰ So Mt. Vā genly *vai narādhipaḥ*; eVā *bhavitā nṛpaḥ*; kVā *vi[ta] narādhipaḥ*.

⁹¹ So Mt, bmVā, Bd. Vā genly, jMt *vimśat tu*.

⁹² So Mt, dVā, Bd. Vṣ, Bh agree: lVṣ *svātīḥ*; aVṣ *Śivaḥ Svātīḥ*; fgMt *Śikhasvātīr*; kBh *Śiras*; jMt *Śiraḥ*. Ca'djVā *Śiva-svāmī*; a²-b'fghkVā *svāmīr*; mVā *svāmīr*. Bh calls him *arindamah*.

⁹³ In beMt, bVṣ *Gotamīp*. Vṣ, Bh *Gomatīp*; lVṣ *Gomati*. Mt adds *hy*.

⁹⁴ So dfgjMt, a²Vā; cmMt *vimśa*. AmMt *eka-vimśaty ato*; CMt *aka-v* by misprint: lMt, a²a²b'fghklmVā *eka-vimśattamo*; CjVā, Bd *vimśat samā*. *Eka-vimśattamo*, '21st king', can hardly be right, because he is not 21st in any list except AMt where two preceding kings are omitted; and he can only be made 21st by omissions.

⁹⁵ So Mt, bdfghlmVā, Bd, though it is redundant. AjkVā *nṛsu*.

⁹⁶ This line only in Mt: dgMt *sa*; bjMt *sat*; CMt *ṣati*.

⁹⁷ In nMt *tatas*; jMt *tatas*; bMt *samas*.

⁹⁸ CbMt *Sulomā vai*; but beMt *Pulomā tu* in next line. Vṣ *Pulimān*; lVṣ *Pul*; aVṣ *Kul*. Bh *Purimān*; kBh *Puri*; fBh *Putrī*. The name should no doubt be *Pulomāvir*. Vṣ adds, *tat-putrah*.

⁹⁹ This line only in eVā: see p. 37.

¹ This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly: ceMt *śrī*; nMt *śvā*; bMt *Śivasrī*; jMt

Śirogrīvaḥ (omitting *vai*). Vṣ *Śātakarṇi Śivaśrīḥ*; lVṣ makes this two kings, *tasya api Śātakarṇiḥ tatas Śivaśrīḥ* (see p. 37): dBh *Svacaśrīr*; nBh *Miduśrīr*; Bh genly *Medas*; kBh *Medās*; fBh *Medās*. This half line in eVā is, *Śirasī putra Aṅgis tu*.

² So Mt genly; cMt *māḥ tu*; bgMt *māsu*. But jMt *māt tu*; CMt *Sulomāt tu*.

³ In bMt *samaiva*; eVā *catasro*.

⁴ In eVā *samāḥ*.

⁵ This line only in Mt, eVā. So Mt genly. Vṣ, afnnrBh agree: cBh *skadhra*: dfgMt, Bh genly, hVṣ *skandah* (altered in sBh to *skandha*); bVṣ *scanda*; kVṣ *sundu*: jMt *Śiraskandho*, eVā *skandah*.

⁶ So cdefjgnMt, eVā; bMt *Sāmako*. ACIMt *Śātīkarṇād*; kMt *Śalāiḥkarṇikā*; jMt *Nṛpaskundo*.

⁷ So cdejnMt; bMt defective *vin-asy*; fgMt *bhāvī tasy*. ACKlmMt *bhavitā hy āt*: eVā *bhaviṣyati samā nṛpaḥ*. No number is mentioned. Perhaps Mt should read, *bhāvī tasmāt trayo samāḥ* (see Appendix I, § iii), and eVā *bhaviṣyati samās trayah*.

⁸ So Mt: jMt *vimśat tu*; fgMt *śivāt tu*: bcelnMt read this line—

nava varṣāṇi Yajñaśrīḥ * kurute† Śātakarṇikah*:

where *bMt *smih*; †bMt *kurune*, nMt *kusate*; ‡cMt, *karṇinā*, lMt *Sātavarṇitā*, bMt *Śaṣakarṇikah*.

⁹ So Vā, Bd: bdghVā *trimsatam*; kVā *trikonatrisatam*.

¹⁰ Mat genly *Yajñaśrīḥ*; dIMt *śrī*; jMt *Yajñah Śrī*.

¹¹ In kMt *Śātakarṇinā*.

¹² So Ca²jVā; mVā *Yajñah Śrīḥ*. Bd *Yajñah Śrī*: a²a²b'fghlVā *Yajñah Śrī*; dhkVā *Yajñah Śrī*. Vṣ, Bh *Yajñaśrīḥ* with

ṣaḍ eva¹⁴ bhavitā¹⁵ tasmād¹⁶ Vijayas¹⁷ tu samā nṛpaḥ¹⁸
Caṇḍaśrīḥ¹⁹ Śātakarṇis²⁰ tu²¹
tasya putraḥ samā daśa

Pulomāvīḥ²⁴ samāḥ sapta²⁵ anyas teṣāṃ²⁶ bhaviṣyati
ek-ōṇa-vimśatir hy ete²⁷
Āndhrā²⁹ bhokṣyanti vai mahīm
teṣāṃ varṣa-śātāni syuṣ
catvāri ṣaṣṭir³² eva ca.

Daṇḍaśrīḥ²² Śātakarṇi ca
tasya putraḥ samās trayah²³

ity ete vai nṛpās trimśad²⁸
Andhrā³⁰ bhokṣyanti ye³¹ mahīm
samāḥ śātāni catvāri
pañca ṣaḍ vai tath-aiva ca³³.

marg. alteration °sāra in aBh; sBh °śīla, altered to °śrī: kVṣ Suṅgaśrīs. Bh adds tat-sutas.

¹³ In eVā °api: 2 MSS of CVā Sāmakaṛṇy atha.

¹⁴ In eVā etc.

¹⁵ In jMt naciḍā (misreading of bhavitā in old Bengali script?).

¹⁶ In benMt yasmād; eVā vastu.

¹⁷ So all: but deVṣ Vījaya; bMt, jVṣ Vījas; eVā dvijah yaśu (omitting tu); bVṣ Dvijajña; lBh Vinaya. Bh says, tat-suto.

¹⁸ So Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly samās tataḥ; benMt samān°; fgyMt [sa] samā daśa.

¹⁹ So Mt genly; eMt Caḍaśrīḥ; egMt Vanda°; bMt Candratīḥ. Vṣ genly Candrasrīḥ; eVṣ Cadra°: dBh Candrasija, frBh °vīja, asBh °vīrya, Bh genly °vijāḥ.

²⁰ Mt genly Śāntikarṇas, with variations; bgMt Śamakarṇis.

²¹ So Mt, eVā. Vā, Bḍ ca.

²² So Vā. Bḍ Daṇḍa-Śrī.

²³ In eVā samās trayam; a¹Vā samāśrayaḥ.

²⁴ So eVā, aVṣ; lVṣ °māvī. Bḍ °māvīḥ. Vṣ genly °māciḥ; cdefjkVṣ °mārciḥ; hVṣ °mādi; bVṣ Anulomāvīḥ. Bh genly Salomadhīḥ; *mBh Sul°; kBh Mal° (all easy misreadings).

²⁵ Mt genly Pulomā sapta varṣāni; CbḍmMt Sul°; where the last syll. of the name has been probably regarded as a particle and ousted by the change of Pkt varṣā to Skt varṣāni. Vā genly Pulov-āpi.

²⁶ So Mt, Vā genly: eMt antyes°, nMt antas°, eMt aninyas°; all mistakes for antyas teṣāṃ, probably the true reading, cf. p. 12, l. 22; p. 18, note 7. Ca²fVā tanyesāṃ ca (f omits ca). Bḍ tatas° c-aṣṣām; eVā san tasmād.

²⁷ So Mt, genly: fgyMt °śati°; dMt °śatis c-ēte; jMt °śad etc ca; nMt ek-ōṇa-naratiḥ hy etc, ceMt °ekānā-n°.

²⁸ So Vā, Bḍ: mVā omits this line.

²⁹ So Mt genly: efgjMt Andhrā; dMt Andhrān; bMt nṛpā.

³⁰ In eVā aksā.

³¹ So Vā. Bḍ, gVā vai.

³² So Mt: nMt ṣaṣṭir, bMt ṣaṣṭim; jMt reads this line—

dvādaś-ādhikam eteṣāṃ rājyaṃ śata-catuṣṭayam.

³³ This line is in Vā, Bḍ: not in mVā. So Vā genly: hVā pañca ṣaḍ va°: bdfjkVā °ṣaṭ ca°; eVā °ṣaṭ sapta c-aiva hi. Bḍ pañcāśat ṣaṭ tath-aiva ca. Vṣ says—

evam ete trimśat* catvāry abda¹-śātāni ṣaṭ-pañcāśad¹-adhikāni pṛthivīm bhokṣyanti; where *kVṣ omits trimśat; ¹hVṣ aṣṭa; ¹lVṣ ṣaṣ pañcā[da]śad. Bh says—

ete trimśat* nṛpatayaś catvāry abda¹-śātāni ca

ṣaṭ pañcāśac ca pṛthivīm bhokṣyanti, Kuru-nandana:

where *aBh has vimśan written above; ¹gBh aṣṭa.

Various Local Dynasties.

Text—AMt 273, 17^b–24 ; AVā 99, 358^b–365 ; Bđ iii, 74, 171–179^a.

Corresp. passages—CV§ iv, 24, 13–16 ; GBh xii, 1, 29–32^b.

The account of these dynasties consists of three parts, the first of which summarizes the number of kings in each dynasty and the second states its duration, while the third adds certain subsequent kings. In the first part the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmanḍa agree generally, but in the second the Matsya has one version and the two others another. Here the dynastic matter in the Matsya ends, and the third part is found only in the two others. The Bhāgavata gives the first part in verses which are much like the texts of those Purāṇas, only the concluding portion of the second, and a very brief notice of the third. In the first part therefore the two versions are printed side by side. In the second part the Matsya version and that of the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa are compared side by side, but in the third there is only the text common to those two. The Bhāgavata statements in both these parts are given in the notes. The Viṣṇu in prose agrees closely with the Bhāgavata.

The Vā and Bđ mention the dynasties in the second part in the same order that all three Purāṇas observe in the first part, but the Mt verses are disarranged in the second part, and are re-arranged here in that order for convenience. This involves no tampering with its text, because each line is complete in itself and independent, except ll. 12, 13 which compose a couplet forming verse 22 and which remain undisturbed ; hence the Mt verses are placed here thus, 23^b, 24^a, 20^b, 21^b, 20^a, 21^a, 22^{ab}, 23^a, 24^b.

The Mt is generally complete ; but *e*Mt omits ll. 12–14 ; *f*Mt l. 8 ; *g*Mt repeats ll. 3, 4 after l. 10 ; *k*Mt omits ll. 4, 5 ; *hp*Mt have nothing. *ACVā* omit ll. 7, 8, but *AVā* mentions them in a note ; most other copies give them ; *a*⁴*Vā* omits ll. 7 (second half)–9 (first half) ; *mVā* ll. 1–3, but they are added in the margin. Of Bh versions *j* omits ll. 1–5, but they are added in the margin ; *bt* have nothing.

These local dynasties are all classed together as more or less contemporaneous. The number of years assigned to them must be considered according to the remarks in *Introdn.* §§ 42 ff., and with reference to the middle of the 3rd century A.D. when the account was first compiled as preserved in the Mt, for the revised versions in Vā and Bđ did not revise the periods¹. If those remarks be sound, the Śrīparvatīya Andhrabhrītyas had at that time reigned 52 years, or (if we read *dviḥ pañcāśatam*) possibly 100 roundly, according to Mt ; while the Vā and Bđ reading is no doubt corrupt and should perhaps be 112 or 102 years. The Ābhīras had then reigned 67 years, the Gardabhilas 72 years, the Śakas 183 years, the Yavanas 87 or 82 years, and the Tuṣaras 7,000 or 500 according to the proper construction of the sentences but perhaps 107 or 105 is really meant. The 13 Guruṇḍas or Muruṇḍas had then reigned half of the quadruple of 100 years, that is 200, according to Mt, or 350 according to Vā and Bđ, but the latter is probably a corruption of the former

¹ Except in l. 6, if Mt reading *dvi-pañcā-* | *to daśa dve ca satam ca vai* ; see *Introdn.* *satam* is right, and if we emend Vā and Bđ | § 41.

reading, for Vṣ and Bh say precisely 199 years. The 11 Hūṇas or Maunas had then lasted 103 years.

Mention of these races is found in the inscriptions; thus Ābhīras in Lüders' List of Brāhmī Inscriptions, nos. 963, 1137 (Epig. Ind. x, Appendix) and Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, p. 14; Sakas, Lüders' list, nos. 1123, 1135, 1137, 1148, 1149, 1162, and perhaps 1001-2, and FGI p. 14; Yavanas, Lüders' list, nos. 669, 965, 1093, 1123, 1140, 1154, 1156; Murundas in FGI, p. 14, and Murundadevī, *id.*, pp. 128, 132, 138; Hūṇas, FGI, pp. 56, 148, 206. A Vākātaka prince Vindhyaśakti is mentioned in Kielhorn's Inscriptions of Northern India, no. 622 (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix).

Mt, Vā, Bḍ.

Andhrāṇām¹ saṁsthite rājye²
teṣām bhṛty-ānvayā³ nṛpāḥ⁴
sapt=aiṣ=Āndhrā⁵ bhaviṣyanti
daś=Ābhīrās⁷ tathā nṛpāḥ⁸
sapta Gardabhinaś⁹ c=āpi
Śakāś c=āṣṭadaśaiva tu¹²

Yavan=āṣṭau¹⁶ bhaviṣyanti
Tuṣārās¹⁸ tu¹⁹ caturdaśa

Bh (with Vṣ).

Sapt=Ābhīrā Āndhrabhṛtyā⁵

daśa¹⁰ Gardabhino¹¹ nṛpāḥ
Śakāḥ¹³ ṣoḍaśa¹⁴ bhūpālā
bhaviṣyanti ati-lolupāḥ¹⁶
tato 'ṣṭau Yavanā¹⁷ bhāvyaś
caturdaśa ca Tuṣkarāḥ²⁰

¹ So *cd* *fn* Mt, Vā, Bḍ. Mt genly *Āndh*²; jMt *sandh*²: *eVā Arthānām*.

² So *cd* *fykn* Mt; jMt *sāsthite*²; bMt *saṁsthite*²; other Mt *saṁsthītā*²: *eVā saṁsthite vaṁśe*. Vā, Bḍ *saṁsthītāḥ pañca*; so *mVā* (defective).

³ So *dfyk* Mt, *eVā*; lMt *-atrayā*; jMt *+dady-ānvayā*. Mt genly *bhṛty-ānvaye*: bMt *-adyaso*. But *fnVā vaṁśāḥ svayāḥ* (for *vaṁś-ānvayāḥ*!), Vā genly *°samāḥ*. Bḍ *vaṁśyās ca ye*.

⁴ So Mt: *fnVā pṇāḥ*. Vā, Bḍ *pṇāḥ*.

⁵ Bh genly *Āvabhṛtyā*; eBh *Āv*⁵; aBh *°c=Āv*⁵; fBh *Āvabhṛtyā*. Vṣ rightly *Āndhra-bhṛtyāḥ sapt=Ābhīrā*; lVṣ *Āndh*⁵.

⁶ So Mt; *eVā sapta c=Āndhrā*. Vā, Bḍ *sapt=aiṣa tu*; *hVā °nu*.

⁷ So Mt, Vā, genly, Bḍ: *dVā °Ābhīrās*; *eVā dār-Ābhīrās*, dMt *var-*⁷; jMt *var-Ābhīrā*; bMt *nāv-Āmīrās*; lMt *nāv-Ābhīrā*: mMt, *klVā* defective; *fgMt Ābhīrās ca*.

⁸ So Mt mostly: Vā, Bḍ *tato*⁸: dMt *nṛpās tathā*, eMt *bhṛtyāś*, cMt *mṛtyāś*, *fgMt nṛpās tadā*: jMt *nṛpās tadā*.

⁹ So Vā, *bekn* Mt, Bḍ: *cMt Marḍ*⁹, but

when repeated *Gardabhilās* as in Mt genly: lMt *Kardabhilā*; jMt *Gatabhṛtās*.

¹⁰ Vṣ agrees.

¹¹ So Bh genly, *alVṣ*: *klVṣ °nā*; pBh *Garbhuttino*. Vṣ genly *Gardabhilāḥ bhā-bhujo*, *hVṣ °bhikā*¹¹: qBh *+daśarddayabhino*; jVṣ, eBh *erp*.

¹² So Mt genly; jMt *Śakāśāṣ*¹²: bMt *Śakāś c=aiṣa daś*¹², *cenMt Śākyaś*¹², but eMt in repeating reads as in text: lMt *+Kosairva daś*¹². But *eVā tath-āṣṭadaśa vai Śakāḥ*; Vā, Bḍ *tato 'tha daś*¹²: *hVā* has *Thakāḥ*.

¹³ So Vṣ. Bh *Kaṁkāḥ*; eBh *Kān*¹³.

¹⁴ Vṣ agrees.

¹⁵ So Bh mostly: *cefjyknq* Bh *ca lo*¹⁵; hBh *na lo*¹⁵.

¹⁶ By double sandhi (= *Yavanāḥ aṣṭau*); *fnVā Yāv*¹⁶: *fgmMt Yavanāś ca*. This half line is in jMt *aṣṭau tu Yavanā dhīrās*, in *eVā tath=aiṣa Yavanā aṣṭau*.

¹⁷ Vṣ agrees: jBh *Javanā*.

¹⁸ In jMt *Tuḥkhārās*; eMt *Tuṣāgāś*.

¹⁹ So Vā, eMt, Bḍ. Mt *ca*; jMt omits.

²⁰ So *Baeghji* mpq Bh: *dsBh °Tuḥkharāḥ*, *rBh °Tuṣkarāḥ*, *nBh* and *v.r.* in *GBh °Puṣka-*

*Mt, Vā, Bḍ.*trayodaśa {Guruṇḍās} ²¹ ca
{Muruṇḍās}{Hūṇā ²⁴ hy ek-ōna-vimśatiḥ ²⁵.}
{Maunā ²⁴ hy ekādaśaiva tu ²⁶.}*Mat.*

Āndhrāḥ ²⁹ Śrīparvatīyās ³⁰ ca
te dvi-pañcāśataḥ ³² samāḥ
sapta-śaṣṭis ³⁵ tu varṣāṇi ³⁶
daś-Ābhīrās ³⁸ tathāiva ca ³⁹
sapta Gardabhilā ⁴¹ bhūyo ⁴²
bhokṣyant-īmāḥ vasundharām ⁴⁵
śatāni trīṇy aśītiḥ ca ⁴⁷
Śakā hy ⁴⁹ aṣṭādaśa ⁵⁰ aiva tu

sāḥ. GbktBh Turuṣakāḥ, cBh °karūḥ. CVṣ
catuṛdaśa Tukhārūḥ, bdeḥjghVṣ °Tuṣārā,
aVṣ °Tukhārā, IVṣ °Kharā.

²¹ Both forms are well supported. Mt
genly, Bḍ *Guruṇḍās*; nMt *Gar*°. Vā genly,
jMt *Mar*°; jVā, nMt *Mur*°; fVā *Mer*°. Others, fḡMt *Pur*°; cḍMt *Puraṇḍās*; eMt
Puraṇjās: 4 MSS of CVā *Mananḍās*, which
ACVā adopt; eVā *Randās* with *tu* for *ca*.
Guruṇḍa occurs in Bhaviṣya iii, 5, 32, where
it is said Vraja-bhāsā, Mahārāṣṭrī, Yāvanī,
and Guruṇḍikā are the four Mleccha bhāsās.
For Muruṇḍa see p. 45. Cf. notes ⁶⁵, ⁶⁸.

²² So Vṣ, dfḡmBh and v.r. in GBh. Bh
genly bhūyo *daśa*, an easy misreading; jVṣ
omits.

²³ So Bh genly; dBh *Sur*°: aBh *Suruṇḍās*,
sBh *Suba*°. Vṣ *Muṇḍās*, prob. error for
Muruṇḍās, which IVṣ has.

²⁴ Both names are well supported. Mt
genly *Hūṇā*; jMt *Hūnā*; lMt *Janā*; eVā
Yauṇā; Vā, lḍl, bMt *Maunā*: nMt *smṛtā*.
See note ⁷⁶.

²⁵ So Mt; dMt *c-ēk*°: ceMt omit *hy*.

²⁶ So eVā, Bḍ. Vā *hy aṣṭādaś*°.

²⁷ So Bh, Vṣ: hBh *Monā*; aBh *Maulā*.

²⁸ Vṣ agrees.

²⁹ In gMt *An*°; dfMt *Andhā*: jMt *yuktā*;
bMt reads this half line *Andhākṣāḥ par-*
vatiyās ca.

³⁰ So cdfḡkmMt; lMt omits *Śrī*. ACMt

*Bh (with Vṣ).*trayodaśa ²² Guruṇḍās ²³ caMaunā ²⁷ ekādaśaiva ²⁸ tu. 5*Vā, Bḍ.*

Andhrā ³¹ bhokṣyanti vasudhām
śate ³³ dve ca śataḥ ³⁴ ca vai
sapta-śaṣṭim ca varṣāṇi ³⁷
daś-Ābhīrās tato ⁴⁰ nṛpāḥ
sapta Gardabhinaś ⁴³ aiva ⁴⁴
bhokṣyant-īmāḥ dvi-saptatiḥ ⁴⁶
śatāni trīṇy aśītiḥ ca ⁴⁸
bhokṣyanti ⁵¹ vasudhām Śakāḥ

Śrīpār°; eMt °parvatīyās.

³¹ In eVā *Randhrā*.

³² So ACbhlMt: cefḡmmMt *te dve pañca*
śataḥ, dMt *dve pañca ca śataḥ*: jMt *tu dve*
pañca daś-āpi ca for this half line.

³³ In fmVā *śataḥ*; kVā *śato*. Read pro-
bably *daśa*; see Introdn. § 41.

³⁴ In kVā *dva ca*°; eVā *dve 'rdha-śataś*.

³⁵ In ceMt °ḥi; nMt °ḥi.

³⁶ In cenMt *sahasrāṇi*.

³⁷ This line is in a¹⁻³bdefghklmVā, Bḍ;
first half in a⁴Vā, *sapta-śaṣṭi śatān-īhu*.
Not in ACjVā, but mentioned in note to
AVā: a¹⁻³bIVā °saṣṭi°; eVā *tu* for *ca*.

³⁸ In fmVā *daśabhīrās*, jMt °bhī . . s: kMt
Darbharomā.

³⁹ In bceMt *tatas tu vai*.

⁴⁰ In eVā *tatho*.

⁴¹ In bceMt °bhīno; jMt °bhrto.

⁴² But better bcegnMt *bhūpā*.

⁴³ This line is in a¹⁻³bdefghklmVā, Bḍ. Not
in ACjVā, but in note to AVā.

⁴⁴ In ekVā *c-āpi*.

⁴⁵ Sic: read *dvi-saptatiḥ*?

⁴⁶ In eVā, Bḍ °im.

⁴⁷ In bḡjMt *aśītis ca*; cenMt *trīṇi ca tathā*.

⁴⁸ In bḡVā °aśītis ca; fmVā *trīṇi 'śītis*
ca; eVā *trīṇi varṣāṇām*: a⁴Vā omits this
half line, see note ⁸⁷.

⁴⁹ Mt genly *śatāny*, jMt *tathā hy*, no
doubt corruptions of *Śakā hy*, and I have

Mat.

Yavanāṣṭau bhaviṣyanti⁵²
 sapt-āṣitīm⁵⁴ mahīm imām
 sapta varṣa⁵⁶-sahasrāṇi⁵⁸
 Tuṣārāṇām⁵⁸ mahī smṛtā
 śatāny ardhā⁶⁰-catuṣkāni⁶¹
 bhavitavyās⁶² trayodaśa⁶³
 Guruṇḍā⁶⁵ Vṛṣalāih⁶⁶ sārddham⁶⁷
 bhokṣyante⁶⁹ Mlecchā⁷⁰-sambhavāḥ⁷¹
 śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyante⁷³
 Hūnā hy⁷⁴ ekādaśaiva tu⁷⁵

emended it so: *bchMt* +*nava*; *eMt* +*naca*.

⁵⁰ So *Mt* genly: *benMt* *c-āṣṭau*^o; *lMt* *v-āṣṭau*^o; *jMt* *Andhā*^o.

⁵¹ In *a*¹⁻² *defgmVā* ^o*te*.

⁵² Sic: better *ca bhokṣyanti*.

⁵³ So *bhVā*; *a*² *gVā* *āṣṭir*^o; *nVā* *āṣṭi*^o; *dVā*, *Bd* *āṣṭi*^o; *fVā* *āṣṭir*^o. *Ca*¹ *a*² *a*³ *ckVā* *āṣṭim* *c-aiwa*.

⁵⁴ So *AlmMt*; *CbMt* ^o*ti*: but *cennMt* *saṃ-āṣṭi-m*, *dMt* *āṣṭim*; see Introdn. § 40. Others, *gMt* *saṃśāsyanti*; *fMt* *saṃśās*^o; *kMt* *saṃśās*^o; *jMt* *prāśās*^o (see p. 16, note ⁷⁸).

⁵⁵ In *bMt* *varṣasyātu*; *lMt* *varṣāṇām* (one syll. short).

⁵⁶ So all *Mt*: read *śatān-īha*?

⁵⁷ In *eVā* *śatānikām*.

⁵⁸ In *jMt* *Tuḥkhār*^o.

⁵⁹ In *eVā* *Tuṣārāṇām* *tu*.

⁶⁰ *CcMt* *ardhan*; *bMt* *śatam ardhā-*; *kMt* *śat-ardha-*.

⁶¹ In *bcjknMt* *caturthāni*.

⁶² In *eMt* *vyam*; *jMt* *samantās ca*.

⁶³ In *nMt* *trayo nṛpāḥ*; *bnMt* *caturdaśa*.

This line and the next go together.

⁶⁴ See note ⁵². This line and the next go together.

⁶⁵ *ACbMt* *Guruṇḍā*; *nMt* *Gar*^o; *gMt* *Kur*^o; *mMt* *Mur*^o; *fMt* *Muc*^o; *lMt* *Puru*-*[śā]ṇḍā*; *ckMt* *Puruḍā*; *dMt* *Su*[*dvi*] *ṛuṇḍā*; *jMt* *Śudandā*.

⁶⁶ In *nMt* *dṛṣ*^o; *ejVā* *prṣ*^o; *blMt* *vṛṣabhāih*.

⁶⁷ In *cMt* *sarvair*.

⁶⁸ *Bd*, *ghkVā* *Guruṇḍā*; *a*² *dfmVā* *Mur*^o; *Ca*¹ *a*² *bVā* *Mar*^o; *a*¹ *Vā* *Pur*^o; *jVā* *Munujā*;

Vā, Bd.

asīti dve ca⁵³ varṣāṇi
 bhoktāro Yavanā mahīm
 pañca varṣa-śatān-īha⁵⁷
 Tuṣārāṇām⁵⁹ mahī smṛtā
 śatāny ardhā-caturthāni
 bhavitāras trayodaśa⁶⁴
 Muruṇḍā⁶⁸ Vṛṣalāih⁶⁶ sārddham
 bhāvyaṇyā⁷² Mlecchā-jātayaḥ
 śatāni trīṇi bhokṣyante⁷³
 Maunā⁷⁶ ekādaśaiva tu⁷⁷

eVā Aṣṇḍā. Regarding these *Vṣ* says—
 ete prthivīm trayodaśa* varṣa-śatāni¹
 nava¹-navaty-adhikāni bhokṣyanti:
 where * this means the 13 *Guruṇḍas*, and so
lVṣ ete trayodaśa prthivīm; yet it has affected
śatāni; but *dVṣ* ete prthivīm *Abhūr-ādyā*
Mum-āntā ck-ān-āṣṭir āttā [sic] *śodaśa*:
 'kVṣ śata-varṣāṇi': 'dhjVṣ omit *nava*. Bh,
 in consequence of the misreading *bhūyo*
daśu (see note ²²), says 10, and applies it
 wrongly to the period instead of to the
 kings—

ete bhokṣyanti prthivīm daśa varṣa-śatāni
 ca

nav-ādihikām ca navatim *:
 where * *eBh* omits this half line.

⁶⁹ In *fgMt* *ślaukṣyante*.

⁷⁰ In *lMt* *muru*; *jMt* *vṛṣa*.

⁷¹ In *fgMt* *saṃyuvāḥ*; *cMt* *jātayaḥ*; *lMt* *jantavāḥ*.

⁷² So *AflmVā* by double sandhi for *bhāvyaḥ*
anyāḥ: *jVā* *bhāv-y-ānnā*; *gVā* *ānye*; *bhVā*
^o*ārtya*; *dVā* *bhāvyaś to*; *kVā* *bhāvya*[*nye*]'s
te, showing influence of both readings: *eVā*
tath-ānye. *Bd* *bhokṣyante*.

⁷³ In *bcgnMt*, *Ca*¹ *Vā*, ^o*ti*.

⁷⁴ All *Mt* *varṣāny* with no name: no doubt
 a corruption of *Hūnā hy* (see l. 5), and I
 have emended it so.

⁷⁵ In *bMt* *ekādaśāni ca*; *fgMt* *aṣṭādaśa*
aiva tu: see l. 5.

⁷⁶ So *Bd*, see l. 5: *eVā* *Maunās to*. *Vā*
 genly *Mlecchā*. *CVā* *Sneccā* by misprint.

⁷⁷ *Vṣ* says—tataś ca Paurā* ekādaśa bhū-
 patayo 'bda'-śatāni trīṇi mahīm bhokṣyanti:

Mat.

teṣ=ūtsanneṣu ⁷⁸ kālena ⁷⁹
tataḥ Kilakilā nrpāḥ ⁸¹.

Vā, Bḍ.

tac-channena ca ⁸⁰ kālena ⁷⁹
tataḥ Kolikilā vṛṣāḥ ⁸².

15

Vā and Bḍ.

tataḥ Kolikilebhyaś ⁸³ ca Vindhyaśaktir ⁸⁴ bhaviṣyati
samāḥ ṣaṇ-ṇavatiṁ ⁸⁵ jñātvā ⁸⁶ pṛthivīm tu ⁸⁷ sameṣyati ⁸⁸.

Dynasties of Vidiśā, &c.

Text—Mt nil; *AVā* 99, 366–372; *Bḍ* iii, 74, 179^b–185.

Corresp. passages—*CVṣ* iv, 24, 17; *GBh* xii, 1, 32^b, 33.

The Vāyu gives the whole, and the Brahmāṇḍa all except line 7. The Viṣṇu is concise but not clear, and the Bhāgavata has only three obscure lines: they mention no names except where stated in the notes. Among MSS *a* *fm* Vā omit l. 7; *e* Vā l. 11; *k* Vā and *b* Bh have nothing.

There are references to the people of Vidiśā, Vediśā, in Kielhorn's 'Inscriptions of Northern India' (Epig. Ind. v, Appendix), namely, Sāñchi inscriptions, nos. 187–524 *passim*; Bharaut inscriptions, nos. 712–885 *passim*. For Vindhyaśakti see p. 45; and as regards Pravīra, a successor of Vindhyaśakti, named Pravarasena, is mentioned with his five successors, *op. cit.*, no. 622. As regards Nukhavān, king

^c where **h*Vṣ *Maunā*, *k*Vṣ *Pauravā*; **h*Vṣ *aṣṭa*. Bh says—

Maunā * *ekādaśa kṣitim*

bhokṣyanty abda¹-śatāny aṅga¹ trīṇi:
where **a*Bh *Maulā*, *c*Bh omits this half line; **g*Bh *aṣṭa*; **h*Bh *anitra*, altered in *d*Bh by later hand to *śatān pañca*; *f*Bh omits this line.

⁷⁸ So Mt genly; *b*Mt **naṣu chatreṣu*: *cdj*Mt *teṣ=ūtsanneṣu*; *g*Mt *teṣ=ūcchinneṣu*; *f*Mt *teṣu cch*^o: *k*Mt *teṣ=ūtsanneṣu*.

⁷⁹ In *bcd**fg**h* Mt *kāleṣu*; *e*Vā *surreṣu*.

⁸⁰ So Vā genly; *d*Vā **tachāsanaś ca*: *e*Vā *teṣ=ūtsanneṣu*. *Bḍ* *teṣu cchinneṣu*.

⁸¹ So Mt, *e*Vā: *l*Mt *Kilāk*^o; *fg*Mt *Kilik*^o: *d*Mt *Kilakalā*, *jm*Mt **kalau*.

⁸² So Vā genly; *b*Vā *Koṭilālakikā*^o, but *Kolikilebhyaś* in next line. *Bḍ* *Kilakilo nrpāḥ*. Vṣ says (*h*Vṣ omits)—

teṣu channeṣu * *Kailakilā* Yavanā bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti:

where **d*eVṣ *cchinneṣu*, *b*Vṣ *putreṣu*, *j*Vṣ

kṣetreṣu, *fg**k*Vṣ *teṣ=ūcchinneṣu*, *l*Vṣ^o *ūtsanneṣu*; *b*Vṣ add *paṇah*, *k*Vṣ *purah*: **ak*Vṣ *Kelik*^o, *l*Vṣ *Kaikilā*, *b*Vṣ *Kaiśilānā*. Bh says—

tailh samsthithe * *tataḥ*

Kilikilāyām nrpatayo:

where **e*Bh **tailh*, *g*Bh **taṁ*, *f*Bh omits this line: **aps*Bh *Kilāk*^o, *em*Bh *Kalik*^o, *l*Bh *Kalinik*^o, *lj*Bh *Kinlinik*^o, *f*Bh *Kinikilāyām*.

⁸³ So Vā: *e*Vā *Kel*^o; *Bḍ* *Kilāk*^o: *k*Vā *Pholikolabhyaś*.

⁸⁴ Vṣ agrees, *c*-*mūrdh**-*ābhīṣiktas* *teṣām* *Vindhyaśaktiḥ*: where **l*Vṣ *a-mūrdh*^o; **l*Vṣ *Vindā*^o. Bh omits.

⁸⁵ In *b*Vā *samā yayāvatī*; *k*Vā *samān parṇamatiṁ*.

⁸⁶ In *e*Vā *bhūtrā*. *Bḍ* *c-aiva*.

⁸⁷ So *d**fg**h**km* Vā, *Bḍ*; *b*Vā *nu*. Vā genly *ca*.

⁸⁸ But 2 MSS of *CVā* *sa bhokṣyati*; *k*Vā merely *saḥ*, but adds *moṭāṁpāṁnāṁ* (for *Maunānāṁ*?) *samāpti*: *e*Vā reads this half line *pṛthivī tu gamiṣyati*.

Nahapāna (see note ¹¹) is mentioned, *id.* nos. 1099, 1131-5, 1174; Purikā in nos. 782, 812, 837-9, and JRAS, 1910, p. 445. Bhogin may perhaps bear some allusion to Bhogavardhana, nos. 264, 266, 373, 572, 797. For Nahapāna see JRAS, 1910, p. 820; 1912, p. 785.

Nr̥pān¹ Vaidīśakāmś² cāpi³ bhaviṣyāms tu⁴ nibodhata
 Śeṣasya Nāga-rājasya putraḥ para-purañ-jayaḥ⁵
 Bhogī bhaviṣyate rājā⁶ nr̥po Nāga⁷-kul-ōdvahaḥ⁸
 Sadācandras⁹ tu Candrāmśo¹⁰ dvitiyo Nakhavāms tathā¹¹
 Dhanadharmā¹² tataś cāpi caturtho¹³ Vaṅgarah¹⁴ smṛtaḥ
 Bhūtinandas¹⁵ tataś cāpi Vaidīse tu¹⁶ bhaviṣyati
 Śuṅgānām¹⁷ tu kulasyānte¹⁸ Śīśunandir¹⁹ bhaviṣyati
 tasya bhrātā²⁰ yaviyāms tu namuā Nandiyasāḥ²¹ kila
 tasyānvaye bhaviṣyanti²² rājānas te trayas²³ tu vai
 daulhitrah²⁴ Śīśuko²⁵ nāma Purikāyām²⁶ nr̥po 'bhavat²⁷

5

10

¹ So Bḍ, a¹⁻³bdefghVā and 1 MS of CVā: other Vā *vṛṣān*.

² Vaidīśik° in eVā; a¹Vā Vaidesīk°: gVā *ca diśak°*.

³ Bḍ *c-ātha*; eVā *c-aiva*.

⁴ So bdfhVā, Bḍ, mVā *crp*. Vā genly *ca*.

⁵ So a¹a²bdeghVā, 2 MSS of CVā: other Vā *svara-pur°*. Bḍ *sura-pur°*. Vṣ *tataḥ Purañjayaḥ*, i.e., after Vindhyaśakti: *lvṣ tataḥ param Pur°*; *abkVṣ °Para-pur°*; *lvṣ Purañpur°*.

⁶ In eVā *°syati nr̥po*, a²Vā *°tato*.

⁷ In bḍhVā *Nāma*.

⁸ This half line in eVā is *Nāga-loka-samudbhavaḥ*.

⁹ In a¹Vā *putraś C°*: eVā *Dāmadhandras. Vṣ Rāmacantra*; *bhVṣ Vāma°*.

¹⁰ So Vā genly. Bḍ *°āmsur*; jVā *°āso*; eVā *°ābho*: dVā *Vaṁdāmśo*.

¹¹ In bḍhVā *tataḥ*; gVā *tu saḥ*: eVā *Nakha-pāna-jah* (see above), which may be the true reading.

¹² In eVā *Vakhamṛta. Vṣ Dharmah*; *lvṣ Dharmavarṇā*.

¹³ In bghVā *°the*; dVā *°tham* or *°tho*.

¹⁴ Vā genly *Vimśajah*; jVā *vimśah bhūmī* (with excess syll.). Bḍ, *lvā vimśajah*: eVā, *cVṣ Vaṅgavaḥ*: *bghVṣ Vaṅgara*; *lvṣ °garā*; *aVṣ °gāra*; *dBh °gari*; *rBh °gira*; *Bh genly °giri*; *aBh °kiri*; *mBh* (misreading *v* as *tr*) *°rangiri*, *eBh (Va) Tuṁgiri*; *cBh Bhṛṅgiri*:

hVṣ Vaṅara; *kBh Vāgiri*. Vṣ genly *Va-rāṅga*: *kVṣ Urdlara* (or *Dur°*). *Vaṅgara* seems the most central form.

¹⁵ So Vā, Bḍ: eVā *Bhūmī°*. *Bh* genly *Bhūtananda* (inverting him and Vaṅgara), *lvṣ °nandi*, *pBh °manda*: *qBh Bhṛthananda*: *kVṣ Kṛtanandi*, Vṣ genly *°nandana*.

¹⁶ So Bḍ. Vā genly *vai deṣe tu* (*bVā nu*): *a²Vā vaimśe sa tu*; *eVā vṛaiśogaiśo* or *vaiśig°*.

¹⁷ So *a¹a²a³ghVā*: eVā *Śūnikā°*; *bdVā Śṛṅgā°*. Vā genly *Aṅgā°* (see p. 32, note ⁴⁷).

¹⁸ So eVā. Vā genly *nakulasya-ante*: *CjVā nandanasy°*, which *AVā* adopts.

¹⁹ So eVā; *akVṣ*, *Bh* agree: *cVṣ Śuśi°*; *gVṣ Śuśir°*. Vṣ genly *Suśi°*; *lvṣ Suśu°*; *bhVṣ Sukhi°*. Vā *Madhu°*.

²⁰ So *bhklVṣ*, *Bh*, *tat-bhrātā*.

²¹ So Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ genly: *fmVā Mandiy°*; *dVṣ Nandriy°*; *hVṣ Randiy°*; *bVṣ [Ra]Nandiy°*; *jVṣ Nandipāsāḥ*. *Bh Yaśonandi*; *hBh Yaśi°*.

²² In eVā *tasyānvavāye bhavitā*.

²³ In mVā *taṁ trayas*; *bdVā tatra yas*; *hVā tan-nayus*.

²⁴ In *bdVā daulhitrayah*: *CVā dohitrah*, *fVā dail°*.

²⁵ So Vā; Vṣ agrees. Bḍ *Śīśiko*; *jVṣ Śībhuka*; *kVṣ Śuśika*; *lvṣ Śukra*.

²⁶ So Vā genly: *dVā °kāyā*, *eVā °kāyo*. Bḍ *Purikāyām*; *gVā Ripuk°*: see above.

²⁷ In *dVā bharet*.

Vindhyaśakti²⁸-sutaś cāpi Pravīro²⁹ nāma vīryavān³⁰
 bhokṣyate³¹ ca samāh ṣaṣṭim³² purīm Kāñcanakām ca vai³³
 yakṣyate³⁴ vājapeyaś³⁵ ca samāpta-vara³⁶-dakṣiṇaiḥ.
 tasya putrās tu³⁷ catvāro bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ³⁸.

Dynasties of the Third Century, A.D.

Text—Mt nil ; AVā 99, 373–382^a ; Bḍ iii, 74, 186–193.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 17, 18 ; GBh xii, 1, 34–37^b.

The Vāyu gives the whole, and the Brahmanḍa all except the last three lines. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata are condensed and not clear ; but they are fuller about Viśvasphūrjī. and the Bhāgavata version is placed on the right side by side with the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa version in ll. 10–14.

Among MSS *a*²*f*mVā want ll. 17–19 ; *e*Vā gives ll. 1–10, then inserts the last part of the *Early Contemporary Dynasties* (p. 23), all the Nandas, Mauryas, Śuṅgas, Kāpūyanas and the first 12 lines of the Andhras, by reason of a large displacement, and then gives ll. 12–19 here, omitting l. 11 : *k*Vā and *l*Bh have nothing.

Bāhlikas are mentioned in Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 141 ; Puṣyamitras, *id.* p. 55 ; Māhiṣatī (= Māhiṣmatī), pp. 375, 497–8, 501, and JRAS, 1910, pp. 444, 867. For other geographical information my Translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa (Index) may be consulted.

Vindhyakānām¹ kule 'tite² nṛpā vai Bāhlikās³ trayah⁴

Supratīko⁵ Nabhīraś⁶ ca⁷ samā bhokṣyanti⁸ triṃśatim⁹

²⁸ *Vindhiś* in *g*Vā ; see p. 45.

²⁹ So Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ says *Śiśuka-Pravīrau* ca ; *l*Vṣ *Śiśuka-Pravīraś* ca. Bh merely *Pravīrakauḥ*. See p. 48.

³⁰ Vṣ adds—ete * varṣa-śatam ṣaḍ[†] varṣāṇi bhaviṣyanti : where * *l*Vṣ *etasmād* ; [†] *l*Vṣ *ṣaṣ pañca*. Bh says—

ity ete vai[†] varṣa-śatam bhaviṣyanti adhi-
 kāni ṣaṭ :

where [†] *e*Bh *ity evaṃ te* [ya], *ar*Bh *bhokṣyanti* ete, v.r. in GBh *yuktā* ete.

³¹ So *bḍfghm*Vā, Bḍ. Vā genly *bhokṣyanti*, *e*Vā °te, which may apply to Śiśuka and Pravīra ; plural instead of dual, cf. next dynasties, l. 2.

³² In *bḍg*Vā *ṣaṣṭiḥ*.

³³ In *bḍm*Vā *purī*[°] ; *m*Vā ends *nau* : *e*Vā *Pulakānś Calakānś* ca vai.

³⁴ So Bḍ. CVā °ti. Vā genly *yakṣyante*,

a[†]*j*Vā °ti. The sing. is clearly right, but see note ³¹.

³⁵ In *e*Vā *vājimedhaiś*.

³⁶ In *e*Vā *samāpte* *bahu-*.

³⁷ In *e*Vā ca ; see p. 48.

³⁸ In *e*Vā *su-mūrtayaḥ*. Vṣ *tataḥ tat-putrāḥ trayodaśa-aiva* (*l*Vṣ = *aite*). Bh *teṣāṃ trayodaśa sutāḥ*.

¹ In *e*Vā *Karmakānām*.

² So Vā genly : *f*Vā *kulīnāte* ; *m*Vā *kulīnā-tena*. Bḍ *kulān-ānte*, Pkt for *kulānām ante*.

³ So *Ceghm*Vā. Bh, *l*Vṣ agree : *k*Bh *Val*[°]. Vṣ genly *Bāhlikās* : *cjl*Bh *Bāhlikāḥ* ; *dk*Vṣ *Vāhlikāḥ*. *Abḍjl*Vā *Vāhnikās* ; *f*Vā *Vāhri*[°] ; Bḍ *Vāhi*[°] : *h*Bh *Vāhni*[°].

⁴ Vṣ agrees.

⁵ In *h*Vā °tāko ; *d*Vā *Suprako*.

Śakyamānābhavad¹⁰ rājā Mahiṣiṇām¹¹ mahī-patiḥ
 Puṣyamitrā¹² bhaviṣyanti Paṭumitrās¹³ trayodaśa¹⁴
 Mekalāyām¹⁵ nṛpāḥ sapta¹⁶ bhaviṣyant-īha saptatim¹⁷
 Kośalāyām¹⁸ tu¹⁹ rājāno bhaviṣyanti mahābalāḥ²⁰
 Meghā iti²¹ samākhyātā²² buddhimanto nav-aiva tu
 Naiṣadhāḥ²³ pārthivāḥ sarve bhaviṣyanty ā-Manu-kṣayāt²⁴
 Nala-vaiṣa-prasūtās te vīryavanto mahābalāḥ²⁵

¹⁰ In *bdVā Nabhāras* (altered in *d* to *Na-bha*°); *eVā Nnaratīras*. *Bd Gabhāras*.

¹¹ So *bdefghlmVā*, *Bd*. Other *Vā tu*.

¹² *CVā*, *Bd bhokṣyati*.

¹³ So *Ca*²*jVā*, *Bd*: *a²-fgmVā* °*līḥ*; *bdhVā* °*tiḥ* (altered in *d* to *rimśatīḥ*): *eVā vimśa-tim*.

¹⁴ In *a¹-jVā* and 3 MSS of *CVā Śakyamānā nāma vai*: other MSS divide it into two. For first part, *flmVā Śakyamānā*, *ghVā Śakyā*°, *dVā Śākyā*°, *bVā Śikyā*°; 3 MSS of *CVā Śakyamāmā*; *eVā Sākṣonāmān*: *Bd Śaikamāno*. For second part, *Bd*, *eVā bhavad*; *ghlmVā* and 3 MSS of *CVā bhavo*; *bVā bhavi*; *fVā savo* or *tavo*; *dVā vīya*. From all these variations I have adopted *Śakyamānābhavad*.

¹⁵ *Bd*, *a¹Vā* and 3 MSS of *CVā Māh*°; *IVā Mahiṣ*°; *eVā Mahiṣyānām*.

¹⁶ *Vā* genly, *Bd Puṣp*°; *a¹Vā Putra*°: *eVā Puṇḍramindrā*.

¹⁷ *Ca²IVā Paṭṭa*°; *a³Vā Paṭu*°; *gVā Paṭu*° or *Padu*°; *hVā Yadu*°; *a¹Vā Puṭa*°; *bVā Paṭa*°; *fmVā Śaṭṭu*°; *eVā Padumindrās*. *Bd ṣaṭ Strimitrās*. Others short, *dVā Yāmitrās*, *a¹Vā saṇ m*°, *jVā Sadamās*. *Paṭumitrās* seems the most central form.

¹⁸ In *gVā tath-aiva ca*. *Vs* says—

tataḥ* Puṣpamitra-Paṭumitrās¹ trayo-daśa¹:

where **bVs* adds *castrayaḥ*; **IVs Puṣya*°, *aVs Puṣā*°; **klVs Paṭa*°, *bjVs Yadu*°, *hVs Pahu*°, *aVs Paṭumitrādyās*, *CVs Padhumi-tra-Padmanitrās*; **hVs sura-varṇeṣu balavān jayo bhaviṣyati trayodaśa*, as if *trayodaśa* belongs to the following words. *Bh* says—

Puṣpamitro* 'tha rājanyo Durmitro' 'sya¹ tath-aiva ca:

where **dfBh Puṣya*°; **dBh Damitro*; **ahBh* 'tha.

¹⁹ In *gVā Mekalāyā*, *bdVā Mik*°; *hVā Mikalayā*.

²⁰ *Vs* says—Mekalās* ca sapta¹ Kośalāyām¹ tu nav-aiva¹ bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti: where **dVs Mekalgaś*, *hVs Meka*[*kū*]*lāḥ*; **IVs sapt=Āndhrāḥ*, *hVs* °*Āndhra*, *kVs* °*ātra*, and *hklVs* add *tataś ca*; **IVs sapta Kauśalāḥ*; **IVs nava*, *hVs tath-aiva*, *kVs tayera*. *Bh* says, agreeing with some of these readings—

eka-kālā ime bhūpāḥ* sapt=Āndhrāḥ¹ sapta Kauśalāḥ¹:

where **dBh bhūmeḥ*; **cmBh Āmbhrāḥ*, *kBh Āmprā*; **arsBh Koś*°, *fBh Kauś*°, *dBh Koś*°. Cf. *eka-kālā* here with the error *Mekakālāḥ* in *hVs*.

²¹ So *eVā*; *Bd* °*ṣyanti ca saptatīḥ*. But *a¹-bdghlVā* °*ṣyantiṣṭi saptatīḥ*; *fmVā* °*ṣyanti saptatīḥ* (short); *CjVā* °*ṣyanti ca saptamāḥ*, and *CVā* mentions *santatīḥ*.

²² So *eVā*; *dVā Koś*°. *Vs*, *Bh* agree, see note ¹⁶. *Vā* genly, *Bd Kom*°.

²³ *Ca* in *eVā*.

²⁴ In *gVā narādhipāḥ*.

²⁵ In *hVā Medyā*; *eVā* either; *a¹Vā Medhā-tithi*.

²⁶ In *eVā* °*kyāto*.

²⁷ *Vs* says—Naiṣadhās* tu tāvanta¹ eva¹ bhūpatayo bhaviṣyanti:

where **kVs Śaiṣarās*; **IVs tata*; **hklVs* stop here: *hVs* omits the whole. *Bh* says—

Vaidūra*-patayo bhāvya¹ Naiṣadhās¹ tata eva hi:

where **cjBh Vaidūrya*, *GBh Vidūra*; **GBh Naiṣadhās*. See p. 50.

²⁸ In *eVā* °*ṣyanti manuṣyayāt*.

²⁹ In *gVā mahāyaśāḥ*, *Pkt* plural.

Māgadhānām²⁶ maha-vīryo
 Viśvasphāṇir²⁸ bhaviṣyati
 utsādyā pārthivān sarvān
 so 'nyān varṇān³¹ kariṣyati
 Kaivartān³³ Pañcakāṇś³⁴ c-aiva
 Pulindān brāhmaṇāṁś tathā
 sthāpayiṣyati³⁷ rājāno³⁸
 nānā⁴¹-deśeṣu te janā⁴²
 Viśvasphāṇir⁴⁵ mahā-sattvo
 yuddhe Viṣṇu-samo balī⁴⁸
 Viśvasphāṇir⁶⁰ nara-patiḥ kliv-ākṛtir ivocyate⁶¹

Māgadhānām tu²⁷ bhavitā
 Viśvasphūrjīh²⁹ puraṇ-jayah³⁰ 10
 kariṣyaty aparān³² varṇān
 Pulinda-Yadu³⁵-Madrakān³⁶
 prajāś cābrahma³⁹-bhūyiṣṭhāḥ⁴⁰
 sthāpayiṣyati⁴³ durmatih⁴⁴
 vīryavān kṣatram⁴⁶ utsādyā⁴⁷
 Padmavatyām⁴⁹ sa vai puri

15

²⁶ In *bd fghmVā* *May°*; *eVā* *Magadhāyān*.

²⁷ In *adBh* *ca*.

²⁸ So *a°d°fghmVā*, Bḍ. *Vā* genly °*sphāṇir* here, but °*sphāṇir* in l. 14; *bhVā* °*sphāṇir*; *eVā* °*sphācīr*; *jVā* *Viṣyaphāṇī*.

²⁹ So *Bh* genly: *gBh* °*sphūrjīh*; *rBh* °*sphūrjīh*; *ahBh* °*sphūrṭti*; *cBh* °*skurṭsih*; *nBh* *Viśva[ra]spharjī*. *Vś* says—

Māgadhāyām* Viśvasphāṭika-saṅjño 'nyān varṇān kariṣyati:

where **ac fghkVś* *May°*.

³⁰ In *dBh* *paran-tapah*.

³¹ Defective in *dVā*, *pārthivān sāsvarṇān*, altered to *pārthivān so va kīrṇān*.

³² So *dekmqpsBh*; *GafBh* *aparo*: *ghjlnrBh* °*ti paro*; *cBh* °*ti puro*. For *Vś* see note ²⁹.

³³ In *hVā* °*varṭtyān*; *fVā* °*varṭtyān*.

³⁴ So *Vā*; *jVā* *Nañc°*. Bḍ *Madrakāṁś*: *eVā* *Yapumāṁś* (or *Papu°*).

³⁵ In *cBh* *Yadra*; *kBh* *Yadru* (or *Padru*): *hBh* *Pulindāyaru*.

³⁶ *Vś* says—Kaivarta-Yadu*-Pulinda-brāhmaṇān* rājye sthāpayiṣyaty utsādy-ākṣhila-kṣatra-jātim:

where **b f hVś* *Yadu* or *Padu*, *gVś* *Yadu* or *Paṭu*, *deVś* *Paṭu*, *kVś* *Paṭṭā*, *lVś* *Vaṭuḥ*, *uVś* *Kaṭu*, *cVś* *Kadhū*: **CafVś* *brāhmaṇyān*, *bVś* *Pulind-ābrāhmaṇān*: **kVś* *uchā-dyośeṣa*.

³⁷ So *eVā*. *Vā* genly, Bḍ °*gyanti*. The sing. is required by the sense and is corroborated by *Vś* and *Bh*; the plural is prob. a mistake through misunderstanding *rājāno*.

³⁸ So *Vā*, Bḍ: *eVā* *rājā tu*. Hence *rājāno* is obviously not a nomin., but the Pkt accus. plural and = *rājñah* (see Pischel's

Prakrit Grammar, § 399), because *Viśvasphāṇi* had, as said above, overthrown all kings and it was he who created these miscellaneous kings. *Rājāno* should have been Sanskritized as *rājñah* with some expletive for the lost syllable, but was mistaken for the nomin. and so remained unchanged.

³⁹ *C=Adharma* in *dBh*.

⁴⁰ *Bhūmiṣṭhā* in *dBh*.

⁴¹ *Nānā* wanting in *eVā*.

⁴² So *bdhjVā* (altered in *d* to °*janāḥ*). Here *te janā* are obviously not the nomin. but the Pkt accus. plural and = *tān janān* (Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, §§ 363, 425), because they refer to the Kaivartas, &c. Not being fully understood they appear Sanskritized as *te janān* in Bḍ; while they were mistaken for the nomin. and were Sanskritized as *te janāḥ* in *a°-d°fghmVā*. *CeVā* read *tejasā* (an attempted emendation?) which *dVā* adopts.

⁴³ But *gBh* °*gyanti*.

⁴⁴ *Bhūpatiḥ* in *fBh*.

⁴⁵ *Vimvasphāṭir* in *eVā*.

⁴⁶ *Kṣetram* in *aBh*; *dBh* *akṣm*.

⁴⁷ But *asBh* *utsārya*; *fBh* *utpātya*.

⁴⁸ Bḍ °*sama-prabhaḥ*; *fjVā* °*prabho*; *mVā* °*prabhā*. After this line *dVā* inserts—

Viśvasphāṭi Kaivartyānām Chakāmś c-aiva Pulindakān.

⁴⁹ *Padmāv°* in *cBh*: see p. 53, notes ^{1, 2}.

⁵⁰ So Bḍ, *bVā*. *Vā* genly °*sphāṇir*; *eVā* °*sphāṭir*.

⁵¹ So *Vā* genly, Bḍ; *a°Vā* *ih=ocyate*; *eVā* *ath=ôc°*: *gVā* +*klivāvīkṛtirocate*; *hVā* +*kliv-*

utsādayitvā kṣatraṁ tu ⁵² kṣatram anyat kariṣyati
devān pitṛiṁś ca viprāṁś ca tarpayitvā sakṛt punaḥ ⁵³
Jāhnavi-tīraṁ āsādyā ⁵⁴ śarīraṁ yaṁsyate ⁵⁵ balī
sannyasya ⁵⁶ sva-śarīraṁ tu ⁵⁷ Śakra-lokaṁ gamiṣyati.

Contemporary Dynasties of the Early Fourth Century.

Text—Mt nil ; AVā 99, 382^b–388^a ; Bḍ iii, 7A, 194–200^a.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 2A, 18 ; GBh xii, 1, 37^c–40.

The Vāyu and Brahmanḍa give the whole of this passage except ll. 12–15. The Viṣṇu gives the whole fully in prose. The Bhāgavata has ll. 3, 4 (condensed into one) and 12–17, and agrees closely with the Viṣṇu. Ll. 12–15 are taken from it and placed on the right, to supplement the account given by the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa ; and they appear to be old ślokaś because they agree closely with the older prose account of the Viṣṇu. Among MSS eVā has only ll. 1–6 ; āVā and ūBh have nothing.

As regards Naiṣadhas and Kosalas see p. 51 ; and for other peoples and countries my translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa may be consulted.

Nava Nākāś ¹ tu bhokṣyanti purīm Campāvatīm ² nṛpāḥ
Mathurām ca purīm raṁyām Nāgā ³ bhokṣyanti sapta vai ⁴
anu-Gaṁgā ⁵ Prayāgaṁ ca Śāketam ⁶ Magadhāniś ⁷ tathā
etān janapadān sarvān bhokṣyante Gupta-vaṁśa-jāḥ ⁸

rāttatirorūcyate ; bVā +klīvāmratirūcyate
(short) ; dVā klīvāsantatir ūcyate.

⁵² Uccādayitvā tat kṣatraṁ in eVā : see note ⁵⁶.

⁵³ Satsut pṛnaḥ in hVā ; bVā sasat^o ; dVā sat^o ; eVā yathākrāmam.

⁵⁴ But dVā Jāhnavi-tīre prāsādyā.

⁵⁵ Vā genly yasyate : a³Vā nyasate ; eVā nyasya vai ; dVā yāsyu, altered to yasma-jveta ; gVā tyaksate : tyakṣyate is suggested in CVā but it anticipates the next line. Yaṁsyate seems the best emendation.

⁵⁶ So Vā genly : bVā sa ny^o ; hVā samy^o ; gVā sa y^o ; eVā niḥkṣipyā : lVā reads this half line sasya sva-śarīraṁ rūpaṁ.

⁵⁷ In hVā nu.

¹ So Vā. Bḍ Nāgās ; eVā Rāndhās.

² Padmāvatīm in eVā : see l. 8. This line

and the next refer to different cities and dynasties, but Vṣ, reading Nāgas in both, condenses the two lines and the preceding mention of Padmavati (p. 52, l. 14) into one statement---

nava Nāgāḥ Padmāvatyām* Kāntipurām* Mathurāyām* :

where *lVṣ Padmav^o nāma puryām, jVṣ Paśāṁvanyām ; eVṣ Kāntip^o, ajkVṣ Kāntāp^o, bhVṣ Kāntiyām ; *hVṣ Medhūrāyām. Bḍ nil.

³ But dVā Nākā ; hVā Nāmā ; bVā Nānā ; eVā Yaunā.

⁴ In bVā sapta vi ; dVā saptatim.

⁵ So a¹-bdefghlmVā, Bḍ. CjVā °Gaṁgam.

⁶ So a³dVā, Bḍ. CbfghlmVā °tum ; a¹a²a³lVā °tu ; eVā Śāketa.

⁷ In bVā Madhyagās ; eVā Makhagās.

⁸ So Vā genly : eVā Gupta^o ; bVā Guhya^o. Bḍ sapta ; lVā Maṇḍhānya-jāḥ. Vṣ fays---

Naiṣadhān⁹ Yadukāmś¹⁰ c=aiṣa Śaiśītān¹¹ Kālatoyakān¹² 5
 etān janapadān sarvān bhokṣyante¹³ Maṇidhānya-jāh¹⁴
 Kośalāmś¹⁵ c=Āndhra-Pauṇḍrāmś¹⁶ ca Tāmraliptān sa-sāgarān¹⁷
 Campām c=aiṣa¹⁸ purīm ramyām bhokṣyante¹⁹ Devarakṣitāh²⁰
 Kalingā Mahiśās c=aiṣa Mahendra-nilayās ca ye²¹
 etān janapadān sarvān pālayiṣyati vai Guhaḥ²² 10
 Strīraṣṭram²³ Bhokṣyakāmś²⁴ c=aiṣa bhokṣyate Kanak-āhvayaḥ²⁵

Saurāṣṭr-Āvanti-Ābhirās²⁶ ca

Śūdrā²⁷ Ārbuda-Mālavāḥ²⁸

anu-Gaṅgā Prayāgam Māgadhā* Guptās[†]
 ca[†] bhokṣyanti :

where *hVṣ Māgadhān, kVṣ Māgadhā, jVṣ
 Magadhā Sukhā; †lVṣ Guptāmś, aVṣ omits
 Guptās ca; †here bVṣ adds Māgadhān, klVṣ
 Magadhā. Bh says—

anu-Gaṅgām ā-Prayāgam guptām* bho-
 kṣyati[†] medinīm †:

where *fBh goptā; †hVṣ bhokṣyanti cor-
 rectly; fBh vai malīm.

⁹ Naiṣadhān in Ca²djVā.

¹⁰ In dghVā Yadukāmś or Pud^o; eVā
 Yadumāmś.

¹¹ In bāVā Śaiśījān; gVā Śaiśikān; eVā
 Śaiśikān; hVā Śaiśūlān.

¹² AVā *topakān (misreading y as p).

¹³ Ca²jVā bhokṣyanti.

¹⁴ So Vā; mVā *ja; Bā jāu: eVā Māla-
 dhānyagaḥ. Vṣ similarly—

Naiṣāda*-Naimiṣika*-Kālatoyān[†] janapa-
 dān[†] Maṇidhāra*-vaṁśā bhokṣyanti[†]:

where *bhVṣ Naiṣadha, kVṣ Śaiśara (see
 p. 51, note ²³); †hVṣ Naimika; †abhVṣ
 yūkān, lVṣ yūkā; †lVṣ padā; †kVṣ dhā-
 raka, deVṣ dhāna, lVṣ dhānya, aVṣ
 dhānānka, bVṣ dhānavaka, cVṣ dhā, hVṣ
 Maṇidhanyaka; †acfkVṣ vaṁśyā^o, lVṣ
 vaṁśo bhokṣyati. Bh, jVṣ omit this.

¹⁵ In fVā Koś^o; dgVā Kośulās; bhVā
 Chosulās.

¹⁶ So ClVā, Bā: a¹a²a³jVā Pauḍ^o; dVā
 Pondās; a³Vā Pāṇḍyās; hVā c=Āndhra-
 Podrās, bVā *Potās; mVā c=Ādha-Pau-
 ḍrāmś, fVā *Pauṇḍrās; gVā c=ānupādās.

¹⁷ In fmVā Tāma^o: dVā Tāmralipt-ānu-
 sāgarān, bghVā Tāma^o, lVā Nāma^o.

¹⁸ In bhVā [Paṁ]Campām cica; dVā
 Paṁcapāṁci.

¹⁹ Ca²a³ffVā *syanti; hVā *syute.

²⁰ So a¹a²gfmVā; bāVā Daira^o. Ca²a³ffVā
 Devarakṣitām, hVā Daira^o. Vṣ similarly—

Kośal*-Audra*-Pudraka*-Tāmraliptān[†]
 samudratata-purīm ca Devarakṣito rakṣi-
 syati[†]:

where *hVṣ Kośalum, cyVṣ Koyāl-, lVṣ
 Kaulpa; †hVṣ Udra, jVṣ Ēdra, kVṣ Ōtra,
 lVṣ Loddhra; †lVṣ Puṇḍra, bcVṣ Pudraka,
 wanting only in deVṣ; †acgjkVṣ Tāma^o;
 †lVṣ rakṣati. Bh nil.

²¹ In gVā tathā.

²² Vṣ similarly—

Kalinga*-Mahiṣika*-Māhendrabhaumā[†]
 Guhān[†] bhokṣyanti :

where *bVṣ puts nakṣatra before Kalinga;
 †defjkVṣ *śaka, lVṣ *śa, hVṣ Māheya-Kaccha;
 †hVṣ *drān^o, lVṣ *drabhaumān correctly,
 jkVṣ *drabhaumān; †blVṣ Guhā correctly,
 jVṣ Guhān, hVṣ omits. Bh nil.

²³ So Ca²jVā; Bā *stra-: a¹a²a³bdfghmVā
 Strīrājyam. AVā Strī by misprint.

²⁴ So bdfhmVā; gVā Bhokhya^o; lVā Bho-
 ksa^o; ACjVā Bhakṣya^o: Bā Bhoja^o.

²⁵ In jVā āhvaye. Vṣ says—

Strīrājya*-Trairāja*-Mūsika*-janapadān
 Kanak-āhvayā bhokṣyanti[†]:

where *aVṣ omit; †so CgkVṣ, but bhVṣ,
 rājya, aVṣ Tepirājya, cfVṣ omit; †cVṣ
 Mūsivā, hVṣ Mūkhika, lVṣ Mūsita, akVṣ
 Mūsika; †lVṣ āsvayo bhokṣyati. Bh, deVṣ
 omit this.

²⁶ So Bh. Vṣ similarly—

Saurāṣṭr-Āvanti*-Śūdrān[†] Ārbuda-Marū-
 bhūmi*-viṣayāmś ca vrāty-ādvij[†]-Ābhira-
 śūdr-ādyā bhokṣyanti :

where *hVṣ Surāṣṭr-Āvasca; †fVṣ Śūdra,
 abVṣ Śūdr-(aVṣ Śūr-)Ābhīrān, hVṣ Bhadr-
 Ābhīrā, kVṣ Sur-Ābhīr-Ārb^o; †hVṣ *bhū,
 bVṣ Maru, kVṣ Mevabhūmi; †or vrātyā
 dvij-, bhVṣ vrātya dvij-, aVṣ vrajñe^o, kVṣ

tulya³⁴-kālam bhaviṣyanti
sarve hy ete mahikṣiṭaḥ
alpa-prasādā hy anṛtā³⁸
mahā-krodhā hy adhārmikāḥ.

vrāty-ādvijā²⁹ bhaviṣyanti
śūdra-prāyā janādhipāḥ
Sindhos tatam Candrabhāgām³⁰
Kauntīm³¹ Kāśmīra-maṇḍalam
bhokṣyanti śūdrā vrāty-ādyā³²
Mlecchāś cābrahma³³-varcasāḥ¹⁵
tulya-kālā ime³⁵ rājan
Mleccha³⁶-prāyās ca bhūbhṛtaḥ³⁷
ete³⁹ 'dharm-ānṛta-parāḥ⁴⁰
phalgu-dās tīvra-manyavaḥ.

Evils of the Kali Age.

Text—AMt 273, 25-34 ; AVā 99, 388^b-412 ; Bḍ iii, 74, 200^b-224.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 18-29 ; GBh xii, 1, 41-2, 23.

After having thus brought the dynasties down to the early part of the 4th century A.D., these Purāṇas launch out into a prophetic description of the future evils of the Kali age, and the Vāyu and Brahmanḍa deal with them at great length. It is unnecessary to set out these passages, because they merely embody gloomy brahmanic forecasts, which were no doubt based on actual calamities, but which have no historic value except in so far as they may portray, more or less really, miseries which the country underwent in lawless times. But the first portion of the description appears to depict the unsettled condition of the country in the early part of the 4th century, and this alone is presented here. The references for it are—AMt 273, 25, 26^a ; AVā 99, 388^b-393^a ; Bḍ. iii, 74, 200^b-203 ; CVṣ iv, 24, 18, 19 ;

rājye 'bhiṣikt- ; || jVṣ Ā[ā]bhīra, aVṣ Ātira.

But IVṣ has only *Saurāṣṭrā* ; deVṣ nil.

²⁷ So Bh, except *GerBh Śūrā*.

²⁸ In fBh *Abhyuda-Pālavāḥ*.

²⁹ Or *vrātyā dvijā*.

³⁰ So Bh. Vṣ similarly (IVṣ omits)—

Sindhutata-Dārvīkorvī*, Candrabhāgā-
Kāśmīra*-viṣayān* vrātyā* Mlecch*-ādayaḥ
śūdrā bhokṣyanti :

where * fVṣ *Dārvīkorvī*, cVṣ °kovī, jVṣ °kevi,
gVṣ °kocaṁ ; aVṣ *Dārvīkorvī*, kVṣ *Davi*°,
bVṣ *Deva*° ; hVṣ *Davakorthā* : ' kVṣ *Itasmīva* :
* fjhkVṣ *viṣayaṁ ca*, cVṣ *viṣaya* : ' abcfhjVṣ
vrātya-, kVṣ *rājyā* : || bhVṣ *Mleccha-śūdr*,
kVṣ *Mlekṣa-śūdr*.

³¹ In *glnrBh* °ā : cBh *Kaute* ; dBh *Kau-*
cīm ; fBh *Kāmūcī*.

³² In eBh *vrātyās te*, cf Bh °ca : dBh *śūdrās*
c-āntyā (one syll. short).

³³ In *afrsBh* *Mlecchā abr*°.

³⁴ So Vā, Bḍ : IVā *kalpa*.

³⁵ Vṣ similarly—

ete ca tulya-kālāḥ sarve pṛthivyām bhū-
bhṛto bhaviṣyanti* :

where * IVṣ *bhokṣyanti*.

³⁶ *Mlekṣa* in cBh.

³⁷ In rBh *bhūpateḥ*.

³⁸ In dVā *a-nṛpā* ; bVā *hi nṛpāḥ*.

³⁹ In fBh *nṛpā*.

⁴⁰ So Bh ; so jBh, altered from *dharmā*
nṛpatayaḥ : fBh *dharmaparāḥ*. Vṣ says—

alpa-prasādā vṛhat-kopāḥ sarva*-kālam
anṛt-ādharma-rucayaḥ :

where * ejVṣ *sarve*.

GBh xii, 1, 41-43. Of this account the Matsya contains only lines 1, 10; the Brahmaṇḍa omits ll. 4-6. The Vāyu contains the whole, but fVā omits ll. 4-6; fjMt omit l. 10; hMt, kVā have nothing. Vṣ has nothing corresponding to ll. 1-3.

A further description of the evils is given afterwards, see p. 57.

Bhaviṣyantāḥ¹ Yavanā dharmataḥ kāmato 'rthataḥ
nāiva mūrdh-ābhiṣiktās te² bhaviṣyanti narādhipāḥ
yuga-doṣa-durācārā³ bhaviṣyanti nṛpās tu te
strīṇām bālā⁴-vadhenāiva hatvā cāiva paraśparam
bhokṣyanti Kali-śeṣe⁵ tu vasudhām pāṛthivās tathā⁶ 5
udit-ōdita-vamśās⁷ tu⁸ udit-āstamitās⁹ tathā
bhaviṣyantāḥ¹⁰ paryāye kālena¹¹ pṛthivīkṣitāḥ
vihīnās tu¹² bhaviṣyanti dharmataḥ kāmato 'rthataḥ
tair vimiśrā janapadā¹³ Āryā Mlecchās ca¹⁴ sarvaśaḥ¹⁵
viparyayeṇa vartante¹⁶ kṣayam eṣyanti¹⁷ vai prajāḥ. 10

¹ In *delh*Vā °ṣyanti ha.

² In *e*Vā tu.

³ In *e*Vā °doṣa durātmanō.

⁴ In *Ca*²Vā bala: *e*Vā strī-bāla-go-vadham
kṛtvā, *d*Vā °bāla-bandhanais cāiva. Vṣ
similarly—

strī-bāla-go-vadha-kartārah* para-sv-
ādāna-rucayo[†] 'lpa-sārāḥ:
where **k*Vṣ °bālāmāradha-rucayo; [†]*h*Vṣ
°ādūtāro, *k*Vṣ parabhgyādānaka, *j*Vṣ para-
para-dāma; [†]*h*Vṣ 'śucayo. Bh says—
strī-bāla-go-dviḥ-ghnās ca para-dāra-
dhan-ādr̥tāḥ*:

where **dh*Bh °ākr̥tāḥ, *e*Bh °āvrtāḥ.

⁵ In *e*Vā bhaviṣyanti Kali-śeṣam.

⁶ In *g*Vā tadā.

⁷ In *e*Vā uditōditi-vamśās. Vṣ says—
udit-āstamita-prāyāḥ sv-alp-āyuso mahe-
cchā aty-alpa*-dharmās ca[†] bhaviṣyanti:
where **f*Vṣ °ch=aty-alpa, *h*jVṣ °ch=ālpa, *l*Vṣ
°chās c=ālpa; [†]*j*Vṣ inserts na. Bh says—
udit-āstamita-prāyā alpā-suttv=ālpak-
āyusaḥ

a-sam̐skṛtāḥ kriyā-hīnā rajasā tamas-
āvrtāḥ.

⁸ *Ca*²*j*lVā te.

⁹ In *e*Vā uditv=ast°.

¹⁰ In *bdh*jVā °ṣyanti ha.

¹¹ In *f*Vā kālenā na.

¹² In *e*Vā vīhītās te; *d*Vā vīhatās tu.

¹³ In *l*Mt samādānu.

¹⁴ So Mt genly; *bf*Mt, *e*Vā Ārya-M°; *l*Mt
varṣā M°; *a*[†]Mt Mlecchā-prāyās ca; *j*Mt ā-
Mlecchās cāiva. Vā genly, *Bd* Mlecch-
ācārās ca, *f*Vā °āvārās°, *d*Vā °āvāṇas°. *CV*ā Sneece° (misprint). Vṣ says—

taiś ca vimiśrā* janapadās tac-chīla-
vartino[†] rāj-āśraya-śuṣmiṇo Mlecchās c-
Āryās[‡] ca viparyayeṇa vartamānāḥ prajāḥ
kṣapayisyanti:

where **l*Vṣ vimiśritā; [†]*l*Vṣ chīl-ānuvart°;

[‡]*k*Vṣ Mlecch-ācāryās, *l*Vṣ °ācārās; *h*Vṣ omits
all after Mlecchās. Bh says—

prajāḥ te bhakṣayisyanti Mlecchā rājanya-
rūpinaḥ

tan-nāthās te janapadās tac-chīl-ācāra-
vādinaḥ

anyonyato rājabhiś ca kṣayam yāsyanti
pīditāḥ.

¹⁵ In *a*²*bg*jMt sarvataḥ.

¹⁶ In *c*Mt °ta; *gn*Mt, *dy*Vā °taḥ: *e*Vā reads
this half line, paryāyai vartamānānām.

¹⁷ So Mt: *g*Mt kṣapayisyanti. Vā, *Bd*
nāṣayisyanti.

Chronological and Astronomical Particulars.

Text—AMt 273, 35–52^a; AVā 99, 413–430; Bđ iii, 74, 225–243.

Corresp. passages—CVṣ iv, 24, 30–42; GBh xii, 2, 24–34.

Concluding passages containing chronological and astronomical particulars about the Kali age are found, more or less full, in all the five Purāṇas. Here the Viṣṇu relinquishes its prose, and both it and the Bhāgavata adhere to an old śloka version (which the Viṣṇu introduces with the phrase *atr-ōcyate*), similar to the version of the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa, but containing some verses not found in those three Purāṇas. Hence it is convenient to divide this subject into three parts.

The first part contains matter which is common to those three Purāṇas, and which the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata give partially. The passages are these—AMt 273, 35–45^a; AVā 99, 413–423; Bđ iii, 74, 225–236^a; CVṣ iv, 24, 30–33; GBh xii, 2, 24–28^a. The Vāyu and Brahmāṇḍa give the whole, the Matsya all except the first two lines, and the Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata have ll. 1, 2, 4–6, 18–20, 22.

Then those three Purāṇas insert 8 or 9 lines alluding to the evils of the age, which may be omitted, and eVāyu omits most of them. The Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata offer instead other verses giving further particulars, and these constitute the second part, namely—CVṣ iv, 24, 34–39; GBh xii, 2, 28^b–32. The verses in the Bh have been slightly re-arranged to correspond to the Vṣ.

The Purāṇas all unite again in the old śloka version and this forms the third part. The passages are—AMt 273, 49^b–52^a; AVā 99, 428^b–430; Bđ iii, 74, 241–243; CVṣ iv, 24, 40–42; GBh xii, 2, 33–34. All give the whole, except that the Bhāgavata omits ll. 39, 40; but as there is considerable divergence, the Mt version and that of Vā and Bđ are printed side by side, and the Vṣ and Bh versions are given in the notes.

As regards MSS cMt omits ll. 21–23; eMt ll. 21–23, 39 (second half)—41 (first half); jMt ll. 15–17, 19; kMt ll. 6–9, 18; lMt ll. 12–15; nMt ll. 13, 14; a²Vā ll. 11–14; eVā l. 16; lVā ll. 1, 2 (first half); mVā ll. 11, 13, 15, and places 12 after 14; h^pMt, kVā, and lBh have nothing.

It is no part of the scope of this edition to discuss these chronological and astronomical particulars, beyond what is noticed in the Introdn. § 25, and in the notes to the translation of this passage, *infra*.

Yadā candraś¹ ca^a sūryaś ca tathā² Tiṣya³ Brhaspati
eka-rāśau⁴ sameṣyanti⁵ tadā Kṛta-yugam bhavet⁶

¹ In mVā *vamśa vamśaś*.

² In jVṣ *yathā*; bVṣ, fBh *yadā*.

³ Śukra in hVṣ.

⁴ Ca^a-b^fghj^lVā *rātre*; mVā *rāve*; kVṣ *etair aṁśeṣu*.

⁵ So eVā, Vṣ, Bh; lVṣ *sah-eṣyanti*. Vā

genly, Bđ *bhaviṣyanti*; CVā *bharīṣyanti* (misprint).

⁶ So Vā, Bđ: eVā, Vṣ, arBh *bhaviṣyati tadā (bdeffjVṣ tataḥ) Kṛtam*; hVṣ gives the line twice and ends first *kṣayam* and then *Kaliḥ*. Bh *tadā bhavati tat Kṛtam*.

eṣa⁷ vaṁśa⁸-kramah kṛtsnaḥ⁹ kīrtito yo¹⁰ yathā-kramam¹¹
 atītā vartamānās ca tathāivānāgatās¹² ca ye¹³
 Mahāpadm¹⁴-ābhisekāt tu¹⁵ | yāvat Parikṣito¹⁶ janma
 yāvaj janma¹⁷ Parikṣitah | yāvan Nand-ābhisecanam 5
 evaṁ¹⁸ varṣa¹⁹-sahasraṁ tu jñeyam²⁰ pañcāśad-uttaram²¹
 Pulomās tu²² tathāĀndhrās tu²³ | pramāṇam vai tathā vaktum²⁴
 Mahāpadm-āntare²⁵ punaḥ²⁶ | Mahāpadm-āntaraṁ²⁷ ca yat²⁸
 antaraṁ tac²⁹ chatāny³⁰ aṣṭau ṣaṭ-trimśat³¹ tu³² samās tathā³³
 tāvat³⁴ kāl-āntaram bhāvyam³⁵ Andhr-ānt-ādyāḥ prakīrtitāḥ³⁶

⁷ So Vā, Bḍ, bcdenMt. ACfgyklmMt evaṁ.

⁸ In eVā eva.

⁹ So Mt, bdehVā. Vā genly kṛtsnaḥ; eMt kṛtaḥ praśnaḥ, cMt kṣataḥ^o.

¹⁰ So Mt genly; cenMt 'yaṁ: eVā vā. Vā, Bḍ ro.

¹¹ Mt mayā kramāt.

¹² So CFgyMt, Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ. Mt genly reads the whole line in the nomin. sing., and bMt the first half in locat. sing. Bh says—

ye 'tītā vartamānā ye bhaviṣyanti ca pārthivāḥ:

but deBh ye bhaviṣyanti pārthivāḥ for the second half.

¹³ In fgyMt tu ye. After this line Vṣ inserts this line—

ete vaṁśeṣu bhūpālāḥ kathitā muni-sattama.

Bh inserts this line—

te ta uddeśataḥ proktā vaṁśīyāḥ * Somu-Sūryayoh:

where *fBh vaṁśayoh, adrsBh vaṁśa-jāḥ.

¹⁴ This line is in Mt, Vā, Bḍ. So Mt. Bḍ Mahānand-, Vā Mahādev-, which both no doubt = Mahāpadm-; see l. 7.

¹⁵ Bḍ °ṣek-āntam.

¹⁶ This line is in Vṣ, Bh. So Vṣ. Bh ārabhya bhavato equivalently.

¹⁷ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ janma yāvat.

¹⁸ So Mt, eVā: InMt ekaṁ; kVṣ ete: others etad.

¹⁹ In celnMt eva; bMt eka.

²⁰ Bh śatam; jBh satam.

²¹ So Mt genly, Vā, Bḍ: cejMt °śat-ōttaram, bMt °śato trayam: InMt, bVṣ pañca-śat-ōttaram. But eVā, Vṣ, Bh pañcāśad-ōttaram.

²² This line is in Mt. So fjmMt; beenMt °te; gMt Pulobhās tu; eVā also Pulomā ca. ACdklMt Paulomās tu. The correct reading

would seem to be Pulomāt tu, referring to the last Andhra king.

²³ So ACdklMt; bMt °Āndhrās tu; fgyMt tato 'ndhrās tu; jMt tathāĀndhrās tu; nMt tathā c-Āndhra; cMt †tathārv-Āndhrā; eMt †tathārvākah. The correct reading seems to be tathāĀndhrāt tu.

²⁴ This line is in Vā, Bḍ. So a' a' a' d' fghVā, Bḍ; mVā °vaktu; 3 MSS of CVā °vaktam (= Pkt vuttam?); a' jVā, 3 MSS of CVā °c-ōktam: eVā (see note²³) tato vaktum; bVā yathā vaktur. Vuttam is most prob. the original Pkt word, and all these are attempts to Sanskritize it without infringing sandhi.

²⁵ In bMt -ōttare.

²⁶ In jMt puraḥ.

²⁷ So Vā. Bḍ -ōttaram.

²⁸ In eVā yataḥ.

²⁹ So Vā. Bḍ °ca. Mt genly anantaraṁ; jMt antare ṣaṭ. This half line in lMt is nā'nāntaram pakṣatāny aṣṭau; in bMt †anantastastanāmatyau.

³⁰ In eMt śatā.

³¹ So also nMt ṣaḍimśat (= ṣaṭ-trimśat); dMt sustr°: bMt, a' bVā ṣaḍ-rimśac, dVā ṣaḍ-v°; hVā ṣatrimśac or ṣaḍr°.

³² So Mt. Vā, Bḍ ca.

³³ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ smṛtāḥ.

³⁴ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ etat.

³⁵ So Mt, efmVā, Bḍ; cMt bhārya. Vā genly bhāvyā.

³⁶ So a' a' fghmVā, Bḍ; bdVā c-Ān°. Ca' jVā Andhr-āntā ye (l omits ye) pra°; eVā sandhān bhāryaḥ pra°. Mt genly Andhr-āntād ā-Parikṣitah; fgyMt Andhr°, cenMt kṣatr°: bMt †sambhrātrādāyarakṣināt, jMt athādyā dīpitās tataḥ. Mt reading is corrupt, because from Parikṣit to the end of the Andhras comprises the two periods in

Bhaviṣye³⁷ te prasaṅkhyātāḥ³⁸ purāṇa-jñāiḥ śrutarṣibhiḥ³⁹
 saptarṣayas tadā⁴⁰ prāṁśu⁴¹
 pradīpten-āgniṇā⁴³ samāḥ⁴⁴
 sapta⁴⁷-vīmśati-bhāvyaṇām⁴⁸
 Āndhrān-ānte⁵¹ 'nvagāt⁵² punaḥ⁵³
 saptarṣayas tu vartante⁵⁷
 yatra⁶⁰ nakṣatra-maṇḍale

saptarṣayas tadā prāhuḥ⁴²
 Pratīpe rājñi⁴⁵ vai śatam⁴⁶
 sapta-vīmśaiḥ śatair⁴⁹ bhāvya⁵⁰
 Andhrān-ānte⁵⁴ 'nvayāḥ⁵⁵ punaḥ⁵⁶
 sapta-vīmśati⁵⁸-paryante⁵⁹
 kṛtsne nakṣatra-maṇḍale

ll. 5-8. The reckoning is from the end of the Andhras onwards into the future.

³⁷ So Mt: cMt °ṣyai; lMt omits. Vā, Bḍ bhaviṣyais; bVā na divyais.

³⁸ So Mt genly: celnMt °samākhyaṭāḥ; jMt, eVā tat prasaṅkhyātām. Ca' a' a' jVā, Bḍ tatra saṅkhyātāḥ; a' Vā °khyātām; bdfghlmVā °khyānām; bMt naṣṭa-saṅkhyā-nāḥ.

³⁹ In lMt [śu]śrū[śa]tṛṣibhiḥ; bMt surarṣi-bhiḥ; jMt maharṣibhiḥ: ceMt purāṇe śruti-sarṣibhiḥ.

⁴⁰ In bedefgjnMt tathā.

⁴¹ This line is in Mt. So ACdkmMt: eMt pāmśru (or yā°); cMt pāśu; nMt prāyuh or prāpuḥ; bMt āyuh; fgMt te syuh; jMt vācyāḥ. These readings and Vā, Bḍ readings appear to be crp. It seems necessary to the sense of this whole passage that some lunar constellation should be meant here, and the true reading may perhaps be Puṣye. Puṣya as the constellation in Pratīpa's time might tally with Maghā in Parikṣit's time (see ll. 22, 24) about a century and a half later; see JRAS, 1910, p. 28.

⁴² So Vā; gVā prāhu. Bḍ prāptāḥ: eVā [ca] tathākhyās ca.

⁴³ So Mt genly: dMt pradīpen°; kMt prātāptep°; jMt pradīptā c-āgni vai. Mt appears to be crp.

⁴⁴ So AClnMt: cdefgjnMt samam; bMt śamam; jMt śase.

⁴⁵ So Vā genly: hVā °roṣṇi; eVā °rājā: dVā Pratīpam rājñi, altered to Pratīpa-rājñi. Bḍ pītrye Pārīkṣite (omitting vai).

⁴⁶ In fjVā vīmśatam; eVā samsthāte. All the readings of this line in Mt, Vā, and Bḍ are no doubt attempts to Sanskritize an old Prakrit śloka, which was obscure. Perhaps the true reading should be, having regard to the forms of letters in the old scripts—

saptarṣayas tadā Puṣye Pratīpe rājñi vai
 samam :

cf. samam in l. 19; or śatam, see l. 22.

⁴⁷ This line is in Mt: cMt sapta; bnMt astā.

⁴⁸ So ACkMt: cdefgjnMt bhāvryena; bMt bhāvena.

⁴⁹ So Vā genly, Bḍ: dVā °vīmśati tair; bhVā °vīmśatair (short); eVā sapta-vīmśe śate, prob. the true reading.

⁵⁰ In eVā bhāvrye.

⁵¹ So ACmMt for first 3 syll.: dMt Andh° fgMt Adh°: beenMt astrānām; jkMt astre-nām. For last syll. cefgjnMt te; ACbmMt tu; dMt trām. The whole is clearly Āndhrān-ānte, see note ⁵⁴.

⁵² In kMt 'nvagā, ceMt °gāt, nMt °gat; fMt 'ndhakāt; gMt dhakāt; jMt 'ṣṭakā; ACMt yadā; bdmMt tataḥ. The correct word seems to be 'nvagāt (aorist of anugā) or 'nugāḥ, the former meaning '(the cycle) followed on again', and the latter '(the Seven Rṣis were) following on again'. The readings are thus equivalent, but the former seems preferable, because the v appears to be original, and was easily mistead as dh in the Gupta script, while yadā and tataḥ are obvious emendations.

⁵³ In jMt sudhāḥ.

⁵⁴ For first 3 syll. Vā, Bḍ Andhrānām, hVā °nā; eVā mantrānām. For fourth syll. Vā, Bḍ te. The whole is clearly Āndhrān-ānte, which means Āndhrān-ānte, Pkt for Āndhrānām ante, as the sense shows. But mVā reads this half line Adhā saṅkhyayā smrtam, which belongs partly to l. 15.

⁵⁵ So a'hVā, Bḍ; and dVā (altered from tvayāḥ); gVā 'nvayā; eVā 'nvayāḥ. Vā genly tvayā.

⁵⁶ In bVā punat; gVā yutah; a'Vā śubhāḥ.

⁵⁷ This line is in Mt. So CGVā°a'mMt; dMt °pravartante: jMt saptarṣay-ṣṭi paryante: a'a'bMt sapta-vīmśati-paryante, ceMt °paryanta-ḥ, kMt °paryataḥ, fyMt °parjanya.

⁵⁸ This line is in Vā, Bḍ: eVā °vīmś-ṣṭi or vīmśe 'ti.

saptarṣayas tu tiṣṭhanti ⁶¹ paryāyeṇa ⁶² śatam śatam ⁶³
 saptarṣinām yugam hy etad ⁶⁴ divyayā saṅkhyayā smṛtam ⁶⁵ 15
 māsā ⁶⁶ divyāḥ ⁶⁷ smṛtāḥ ⁶⁸ ṣaṭ ca ⁶⁹ divy-ābdāni tu ⁷⁰ sapta hi ⁷¹
 tebhyaḥ ⁷² pravartate kālo ⁷³ divyāḥ saptarṣibhis ⁷⁴ tu vai ⁷⁵
 saptarṣinām ⁷⁶ tu ⁷⁷ yau pūrvau ⁷⁸ dr̥śyete ⁷⁹ uditau niśi ⁸⁰
 tayo madhye tu nakṣatraṇi ⁸¹ dr̥śyate yat ⁸² samam divi ⁸³
 tena saptarṣayo ⁸⁴ yuktā jñeyā ⁸⁵ vyomni śatam samāḥ ⁸⁶ 20
 nakṣatrāṇām ṛṣinām ca ⁸⁷ yogasyaitan ⁸⁸ nidarśanam

⁶⁰ In *dVā* paryate; *bVā* payate.

⁶¹ In *bdefg* Mt *kṛtsne*.

⁶² In *bMt* bhidyanti.

⁶³ In *fMt* paryāye sā.

⁶⁴ In *fMt* satam satam; *dMt* śataḥ śatam; *a'1a'2a'4d* *fglVā* śatāc chatam; *bjVā* śatān śatam; *mVā* śatā śutam; *a'bMt* śatam samāḥ.

⁶⁵ So *Vā*; *eVā* hy ete; *Bd* tv etad; *fgMt* yuge hy etad, *kMt* ete; *bhVā* eugam hy etad. But *bMt* tu paryanta, *cenMt* paryāye. *Mt* genly upary etat.

⁶⁶ So *Vā*, *Bd*: *cenMt* tat smṛtam divya-saṅkhyayā; *kMt* smṛtam vai divya-saṅkhyayā, *ACMt* saṅjñayā; *fgMt* smṛtam divyam tu saṅkhyayā; *bmMt* saṅjñayā, and *dMt* crp.

⁶⁷ So *Bd*. *Vā* genly sā sā; *jVā* sāsa; *mVā* sāpa; *hVā* sayā; *fVā* sā[sā]ya. *Mt* samā; *nMt* samo; *eMt* kṣado; *cMt* tado. Instead of this line *eVā* has two other lines—

ṣaṣtir daivata-yugānām c-aika saptabhir
 epi ca

trīmśac c-ānyāni varṣāni smṛtaḥ saptarṣi-
 vatsaraḥ.

⁶⁸ So *Mt*, *Bd*. *Vā* divyā: *nMt* ditās; *ceMt* divāt.

⁶⁹ *Vā* smṛtā; *bcefglnMt* tathā.

⁷⁰ So *Bd*. *Mt*, *Vā* ṣaṣtir erroneously.

⁷¹ So *ACjklMt*; *cnMt* ca; *eMt* divy-āṣṭāni ca. *Bd* divy-ābdās c-aiva. *Vā* divy-āhnās c-aiva; *bdmMt* āhāni tu (*b*, *ca*), *fgMt* āhāniś ca.

⁷² So *Bd*: *cdefgnMt*, *gVā* saptati-ḥ; other *Mt*, *Vā* genly saptabhiḥ; *jVā* saptāmiḥ; *bhVā* saptarṣanabhiḥ, where in *bVā* nabhiḥ represents *tebhyaḥ* in next line.

⁷³ So *Vā*, *Bd*, *boeklnMt*: *eVā* ebhyaḥ; other *Mt* ebhiḥ: *dVā* reads this half line pravartate mahān kālo.

⁷⁴ In *kMt* pravartitaḥ, *dMt* pravartane; *bMt* tite kāle.

⁷⁵ In *cenMt* saptarṣitas.

⁷⁶ So *Mt*, *eVā*. *Vā*, *Bd* taiḥ.

⁷⁷ In *fgMt* sapta-ṛṣam.

⁷⁸ In *ACdkmMt*, *Vs* genly, *aBh* ca.

⁷⁹ So *CGVa'mMt*, *Bd*, *Vs*, *Bh*; *arBh* pūrvau yau. *Vā* ye pūrvā (altered in *dVā* to yau pūrvau), *akVs* pūrve: *a'1-bdefglnMt*, *eVā* yaḥ pūrvam, *kMt* pūrva, *jMt* pūrve. The dual is right as there are two stars, and see next line.

⁸⁰ So *CGVa'mMt*, *Bd*, *Vs*, *Bh*, *dVā*. * *Vā* genly dr̥śyante; *ehVā*, *aVs* dr̥śyate. For this half line *a'1-bdefglnMt* read udyan (*l*, udyat; *j*, mudyan; *k*, sudhan) vai dr̥śyate niśi (*j*, divi; *k* omits); *fgMt* udyāte dr̥śyate niśi.

⁸¹ *CGVa'mMt* hy uditau niśi; *eVā* hy uditō. *Vs*, *Bh* uditau divi; *aVs* bhudyitau; *jkVs*, *jBh* uditō; *gBh* uditē. *Vā*, *Bd* uttarā-diśi.

⁸² So *Mt* genly, *Bd*; *fgMt* madhye 'ti; *eVā* madhye ca [tam]; *bMt* mādye tu rajatam. *Bh*, *blVs* tayoḥ tu madhye nakṣatraṇi; *Vs* madhya-nak; *kVs* madhyamam kṣatraṇi. In *a'2Vā* tato madhye ca nakṣatraṇi; *Vā* genly madhyena ca kṣetraṇi; *bdhVā* cākṣetraṇi (altered in *d* to ca nakṣatraṇi); *mVā* crp.

⁸³ In *nMt* yaḥ; *eVā*, *bVs*, *dfkqBh* tat; *ceMt* sa; *bMt* ca.

⁸⁴ *Vs*, *Bh* niśi.

⁸⁵ *Bh* ten-aita ṛṣayo; *aberBh* ten-aiva; *fBh* tena vai.

⁸⁶ So *Vā*, *Bd*; *IVā* yayā. *Mt* genly jñeyā yuktā, *jMt* muktā, *bdMt* bhuktā; *IMt* devā yuktā. *Vs*, *Bh* yuktās tiṣṭhanty, *aVs* muktās; *kVs* muktāsthityanty; *fBh* yuktā bhavanty.

⁸⁷ In *bVā* śate. *Vs*, *Bh* abda-satam nṛṇām; *hVs*, *gBh* aṣṭa-s; *kVs* aka-s.

⁸⁸ In *eVā* ca sarveṣāḥ.

⁸⁹ So *Mt*, *Vā* genly: *bdgVā* yogasya. *Bd*

saptarṣayo Maghā-yuktāḥ ⁸⁹ kāle Pāriksite ⁹⁰ śatam ⁹¹
Andhr-ānte ⁹² tu ⁹³ catur-vimśe ⁹⁴ bhaviṣyanti ⁹⁵ śataṁ samāḥ ⁹⁶.

Viṣṇu.
te tu Pāriksite kāle
Maghāsv āsan ⁹⁷ dvijottama

tadā pravṛttaś ca ⁹⁹ Kalir dvādaś-ābda¹-śat-ātmakaḥ
yad-aiva bhagavad-Viṣṇor
amśo yāto ³ divaṁ dvija ⁴
Vasudeva-kul-ōdbhūtas
tad-aiva Kalir āgataḥ ⁶

yāvat sa pāda-padmābhyām
pasparś-ēmaṁ vasundharām
tāvat prthvī-pariṣvaṅge
samartho n-ābhavat Kalih
gate sanātanasy-ānśe ¹⁰
Viṣṇos tatra bhuvo ¹¹ divam ¹²
tatyāja s-ānujo rājyaṁ
Dharma-putro Yudhiṣṭhirah

Bhāgavata.
te tvadīye dvijāḥ kāle
adhunā c-āśritā ⁹⁸ Maghāḥ
yadā devarṣayaḥ sapta
Maghāsu vicaranti hi 25

Viṣṇor bhagavato ² bhānuḥ
Kṛṣṇ-ākhyo 'sau ⁵ divaṁ gataḥ

tad-āviśat Kalir lokam
pāpe yad ramate janaḥ ⁷
yāvat sa pāda-padmābhyām
sprśann āste ⁸ Ramā-patih
tāvat Kalir vai prthivim
parākrāntuṁ na c-āśakat ⁹ 30

bhogasy° : hVā *yogyasya tan* ; bMt *tu yogasy-*
ēti ; nMt reads this half line *yāgasy-ēti*
darśayan.

⁸⁹ Bđ *hy ath-āyuktāḥ* ; fgm̄t *mayā hy*
uktāḥ, dMt *may-āpy°* ; eVā *mayā proktāḥ*.

⁹⁰ In jMt this half line is *kālena paritoṣitāḥ*,
kMt °lām.

⁹¹ In nMt *śrutam* ; bMt *kṣutan* ; fgm̄t
same ; mMt *divi*.

⁹² So a'a'a'ghVā ; lVā *Anḥh°*, bVā *Adhm°*,
dVā *Adhry°* ; eVā *Andhān-ānte* (omitting
tu) in Pkt form, see note ⁹⁴. Cu²jmVā, lPd
Andhr-ānśe, fVā *Adhr°*. Mt genly *brāh-*
maṇāś (= *saptarṣayaḥ* ?) ; CMt °nas ; fgm̄t
°nam.

⁹³ So Mt genly ; jMt *ca*. Vā genly, Bđ *sa-*.

⁹⁴ CbfgMt °śa ; jMt, dVā °śo ; nMt °śad.

⁹⁵ In fMt, dVā °syati.

⁹⁶ So Mt, Bđ ; fMt *satam°* ; dVā *sate°*
(altered to *gate°*) ; jm̄t, fVā *sate mama*,

bhMt °manā, gMt °matā : eVā *śatan tadā* ;
lVā *same matā*. AVā *mate mama*.

⁹⁷ In bVś *Maghās c-āsan* ; kVś + *Maghā-*
dyāsan ; ajVś *crp*.

⁹⁸ In gBh *hy āśritā*.

⁹⁹ So Vś. Bh *tu*.

¹ In hVś, gBh *āsta* ; lVś *ātma*.

² In dBh *Viṣṇus tu bhagavān*.

³ In abVś *jāto* ; kVś *amśa-jāto*.

⁴ In kVś *dvijottama*.

⁵ In eBh *sa* : dBh *Kṛṣṇo 'sau* ; eBh
+ *Kṛṣṇasyotsau* apptly.

⁶ In bVś °aiv-ātr-āgataḥ *Kalih*.

⁷ In dBh *manah*.

⁸ In fBh *āsīd*.

⁹ In fBh *v-ās°* ; kqrBh *c-āśakṛt*.

¹⁰ In deVś -ānte.

¹¹ In kVś *trayo* ; aVś *divo*.

¹² In ahVś *divi*.

Viṣṇu.

viparītāni drṣṭvā ca
 nimittāni sa Pāṇḍavaḥ
 yāte Kṛṣṇe cakārātha
 so 'bhiṣekam Parikṣitaḥ ¹³
 prayāsyanti yadā cāite
 Pūrv-Āśādhām maharṣayaḥ
 tadā Nandāt ¹⁶ prabhṛty ¹⁶ eṣa ¹⁷ Kalir vṛddhiṁ gamiṣyati ¹⁸.

Bhāgavata.

yadā Maghābhyo ¹⁴ yāsyanti
 Pūrv-Āśādhām maharṣayaḥ 35
 Kalir vṛddhiṁ gamiṣyati ¹⁸.

yasmin Kṛṣṇo divaṁ yātas ¹⁹ tasminn eva tadāhani ²⁰
 pratipannaṁ Kali-yugaṁ ²¹ tasya saṅkhyāṁ nibodhata ²²
 catuḥ-śata²³-sahasraṁ tu
 varṣāṇāṁ ²⁴ vai ²⁵ smṛtam budhaiḥ ²⁶
 ṣaṣṭi-varṣa²⁸-sahasraṇi
 saṅkhyātam ²⁹ mānuṣeṇa tu ³⁰

sahasraṇāṁ śatānāḥ
 triṇi mānuṣa-saṅkhyayā ²⁷
 ṣaṣṭiṁ cāiva sahasraṇi
 varṣāṇāṁ tucyate ³¹ Kalih ³² 40

¹³ So all Vṣ, but CVṣ °kṣite.

¹⁴ In bBh °bhyāṁ; dBh Maghāto.

¹⁶ In jVṣ °Nanda, eBh °Nandāt; dBh tadā
 tadā: rBh tato Nandāt.

¹⁶ In deVṣ prabhūm.

¹⁷ In bjkVṣ, eBh eva.

¹⁸ In cBh kariṣyati.

¹⁹ In eVā divā jāta: jMt reads—

yadā Kṛṣṇas chavi yātaḥ śuklo Nārāyaṇas
 tathā.

²⁰ So Mt, eVā, Vṣ, Bh. Vā, Bḍ tadā dīne,
 altered in dVā to tad-āditaḥ.

²¹ So Mt, eVā, Vṣ, Bh. Vā, Bḍ °pannaḥ
 °yugah.

²² So Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ °nibodha me. Mt pra-
 māṇam tasya me śṛṇu; IMt prapannaṁ.
 Bh iti prāhuḥ purā-vidaḥ; dBh iti-r-āhuḥ,
 see Appendix I, § ii.

²³ So Mt; jMt satī: eMt satī: a²Mt ṣaṣṭi;
 dmMt ṣaṭ (one syll. short).

²⁴ In bMt varṇāni: eMt reads this half
 line tadā sandhyā pravartate.

²⁵ In cMt yat; fjkMt tat; dMt tu; bMt
 na (for nu?).

²⁶ In jMt tathā.

²⁷ So Vā, Bḍ.

²⁸ So bjkInMt; a¹⁻³dmMt ṣaṣṭir°; cfgMt
 ṣaṣṭiṁ. ACMt catvāry aṣṭa-.

²⁹ In hfgnMt °khyātā; dMt °khyāte.

³⁰ In jMt tat.

³¹ So Bḍ, fVā; gVā tuc°; bVā tuc°; dVā
 tucyāta, altered to tu smṛtaḥ; mVā rūcyate
 (for r-ucyate?), see Appendix I, § ii. Vā
 genly ucyate.

³² Instead of this and the preceding line
 Vṣ has these lines—

triṇi lakṣāni varṣāṇāṁ* dvija mānuṣa'-
 saṅkhyayā

ṣaṣṭiṁ cāiva sahasraṇi bhaviṣyaty eṣa vai
 Kalih:

where *hVṣ varṣāni; °IVṣ varṣāṇān dvija.
 Bh omits this statement.

³³ In gMt dirya-. CVā dirye.

³⁴ So a²a²cfjklmnMt: CGVa¹a²bdMt
 °saṅkhyā°; jMt tathā sandhy-āpav°, unless
 it = °sandhyā prav°.

³⁵ So Vā genly: fmVā °āṁsam hi kīrtite,
 Bḍ °āṁsē°; jVā °sandhyā sihā kīrtite. But
 glVā °sandhy-āṁsa hi kīrtiyate, a¹a²Vā
 °sandhyā sā hi°, bhVā °sandhyā sā hi [tā]°:
 dVā for this half line (with clerical errors
 uncanceled) saṁdvedhiṣ ca iti tathā saṁdhyā
 saṁdhy-āṁsa sahita kīrtiyate: eVā sa-sandhy-
 āṁsam udāhṛtam. For this line Vṣ reads—
 śatāni tāni divyāni sapta pañca ca
 saṅkhyayā*:

where *hVṣ diryayā; but sandhyayā ap-
 pears to be the correct word since 1200

divyaṃ varṣa-sahasraṃ tu
tadā sandhyā pravartate ³⁴
niḥśeṣe tu ³⁶ tadā ³⁷ tasmin ³⁸ Kṛtaṃ vai pratipatsyate ³⁹.

divyaṃ ³³ varṣa-sahasraṃ tu
tat-sandhy-ānśam prakīrtitam ³⁵

divine years include the two sandhyās. Bh
says—

divy-ābdānām * sahasr-ānte caturthe tu'
punaḥ Kṛtaṃ :

where * *gkp*Bh *āṣṭānām* ; ' *e*Bh *caturthena*.

³⁶ This line is in Mt, Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ. So Mt,
*e*Vā. Vā, Bḍ ^{ca} ; *d*Vā *niḥśeṣe ca*. Vṣ
niḥśeṣeṇa, *j*Vṣ ^{śeṣanām}.

³⁷ Vṣ *tatas*.

³⁸ In *j*Mt *tasya*.

³⁹ So Mt, Vā, Bḍ. Vṣ *bhaviṣyati punaḥ*
(*e*Vṣ *tadā*) *Kṛtaṃ*. Bh adds—

*bhaviṣyati yadā * nṛṇām mana ātma-*
prakāśakam :

where * *adṛ*Bh and v. r. in *G*Bh *tadā* ; ' *e*Bh
ātm-āp°.

TRANSLATION

This translation is close to the original though not absolutely literal, and generally combines the various versions where they supplement one another. Words in italics are not expressed in the original but are supplied to complete the meaning. The notes deal only with the salient points, and for the rest reference must be made to the notes to the original text.

Preface.

Listen as I narrate all future *events*, as Vyāsa, unwearied in work, proclaimed to me formerly, both the future Kali age and the manvantaras also. Thus I will first declare now the kings who are to be, both those descended from Aila¹ and the Ikṣvākus and also the kings descended from Sudyumna², among whom the splendid kṣatriya stock of the families of Aila and Ikṣvāku is brought to an end. I will proclaim all those kings *as* mentioned in the Bhaviṣya *Parāṇa*. Moreover *there will be* other kings besides them, who shall arise, kṣatriyas, pāraśavas³, śūdras, and others who will be foreigners; Andhras, Śakas and Pulindas, Cūlikas and Yavanas, Kai-vartas, Ābhīras and Śavaras, and others who will be of Mleccha origin; Pauravas, Vitihotras, Vaidiśas, five⁴ Kosalas, Mekalas, Kośalas⁵, Pauṇḍras, Gaunardas, and Svasphrakas, Sunidharmas, Śakas, Nīpas and others who will be of Mleccha race. I will declare those kings according to the total of their years⁶ and by name.

Pauravas.

Abhimanyu's son by Virāṭa's daughter Uttarā was Parīkṣit. Parīkṣit's son was king Janamejaya who was very righteous. From Janamejaya was born valiant Śatānīka. Śatānīka's son was valiant Aśvamedhadatta.

From Aśvamedhadatta was born a victorious son, righteous Adhisīmākṛṣṇa⁷, who now *reigns* great in fame.

Adhisīmākṛṣṇa's son will be king Nicakṣu⁸. When the city Hastināpura is carried away by the Ganges, Nicakṣu will abandon it and will dwell in Kauśāmbī.

¹ That is the Pauravas.

² See p. 2, note ¹⁵.

³ A mixed caste said to be descended from a brahman father and śūdra mother.

⁴ This would seem to be meant for Pañcālās.

⁵ The people of Mahākosala apptly.

⁶ Or Mt, 'according to their succession'.

⁷ Or *Aśīmākṛṣṇa*.

⁸ Or *Vīrakṣu*. Vā *Nīrvaktra*. Bh *Nemi-cakra*.

He will have eight sons of great might and valour. His eldest son *will be* Uṣṇa¹; after Uṣṇa Citraratha is remembered; after Citraratha Śucidratha²; and after Śucidratha Vṛṣṇimat³; and after Vṛṣṇimat Suṣeṇa will be a pure king. After Suṣeṇa Sunītha⁴ will be king; after Sunītha will be Ruca⁵; after him will be Nṛcakṣus⁶. Nṛcakṣus' heir will be Sukhībala⁷; and Sukhībala's son will be king Pariplava⁸; and Pariplava's son will be king Sunaya⁹. His heir Medhāvin will be king; and Medhāvin's son will be Nṛpañjaya. Durva¹⁰ *will be* his son; and Tigmātman his son. After Tigma will be Bṛhadratha; after Bṛhadratha Vasudāna¹¹; after Vasudāna Śātānika; after him will be Udayana¹²; and after Udayana will be the warrior king Vahīnara¹³; and Vahīnara's son will be Daṇḍapāṇi¹⁴. After Daṇḍapāṇi Nirāmitra¹⁵; and after Nirāmitra Kṣemaka.

These 25 kings will exist born of Pūru's race. In this connexion this genealogical verse was sung by ancient brahmans—'The race honoured by gods and rishis, from which sprang brahmans and kṣatriyas, will verily on reaching Kṣemaka reach its end in the Kali age.' Thus has been correctly proclaimed this Paurava race, *the offspring* of Pāṇḍu's wise son, high-souled Arjuna.

Aikṣvākus.

Next I will declare *the race* of the high-souled Ikṣvākus. Bṛhadbala's heir was the warrior king Bṛhatkṣaya¹⁶. His son was Urukṣaya¹⁶; after Urukṣaya was Vatsavyūha¹⁷; after Vatsavyūha Prativyoma¹⁸.

His son is Divākara¹⁹ who now rules the city Ayodhyā in Madhyadeśa.

Divākara's *successor* will be famous Sahadeva. Sahadeva's heir *will be* high-minded Bṛhadaśva²⁰; his *successor* will be Bhānuratha²¹; and his son will be Pratīśva²²; and Pratīśva's son will be Supratīka²³. His son *will be* Murudeva²⁴, and his son Sunakṣatra. After Sunakṣatra will be victorious Kinnarāśva²⁵; and Antarikṣa will be Kinnarāśva's great son. After Antarikṣa *will be* Suparṇa²⁶; and

¹ Mt *Bhūri*.

² Bh *Kaviratha* and *Kuv*°.

³ Or *Vṛṣṇimat*. Vā *Dhṛṣṇimat*.

⁴ Vā *Sutīrtha*.

⁵ Vṣ *Rca*.

⁶ Vā *Tricakṣa*.

⁷ Vṣ *Sukhābala*. Bh *Sukhīnala*.

⁸ Or *Paripluta* or *Pariṣṇava*.

⁹ Mt *Sutapas*.

¹⁰ Mt *Urua*. Vṣ *Mṛdu*. Gr *Hari*.

¹¹ Mt *Vasudāman*. Gr *Sudānaka*. Bh *Sudāsa*.

¹² Gr *Udāna*. Bh *Durdamana*.

¹³ Or *Mahīnara*. Vṣ *Ahīnara*.

¹⁴ Vṣ *Khaṇḍapāṇi*.

¹⁵ Vṣ *Naranātra*. Bh *Nimi*.

¹⁶ For the variations in these names see p. 9.

¹⁷ Mt *Vatsadroha*. Bh *Vatsavṛddha*. Vṣ inserts a king *Vatsa* before him.

¹⁸ Vā *Prativyūha*.

¹⁹ Bh *Bhānu Dhvārka*.

²⁰ Mt *Dhruvāśva*.

²¹ Bh *Bhānumat*. Mt *crp*.

²² Mt *Pratīpāśva*. Bh *Pratīkāśva*. Gr *Pratīvyā*.

²³ Mt *Supratīpa*. Vā *Supratita*. Gr *Pratītika*.

²⁴ Vā *Sahadeva*.

²⁵ Or *Kinnara*. Bh *Puṣkara*.

²⁶ Mt *Suṣeṇa*. Vṣ *Suvarṇa*. Bh *Sutapas*.

after Suparṇa Amitrajit¹. His son *will be* Bṛhadbhrāja². Dharmin³ is remembered as his son. Dharmin's son will be Kṛtañjaya. Kṛtañjaya's son will be wise Rapañjaya⁴; and after Rapañjaya will be Sañjaya, a warrior king. Sañjaya's son *will be* Śākya. After Śākya *will be* king Śuddhodana⁵. Śuddhodana's *son* will be Siddhārtha; Rāhula⁶ *will be his* son. After him will be Prasenajit⁷. After him will be Kṣudraka. After Kṣudraka will be Kulaka⁸. After Kulaka Suratha is remembered; and Suratha's *son* Sumitra will be the last king.

These Aikṣvākus have been declared, who will exist in the Kali age; born in Bṛhadbala's lineage they will enhance their family, being warriors and learned, true to their word, self-restrained. *These* kings who were ancient have been all declared. In this connexion this genealogical verse was sung by ancient brahmins—'This race of the Ikṣvākus will terminate with Sumitra; on reaching king Sumitra it will indeed reach its end in the Kali age.' Thus has been declared the kṣatriya stock descended from Manu, and that descended from Aila.

Bārhadṛathas.

Next I will declare the Bārhadṛathas of Magadha, who are kings in Sahadeva's lineage in Jarāsandha's race, those past, those existing and also those who will exist. I will declare them according to their prominence: listen as I speak.

When the Bhārata battle took place and Sahadeva was slain, his heir Somādhi⁹ became king in Girivraja; he reigned 58 years. In his lineage Śrutaśravas was 64 years¹⁰. Ayutāyus reigned 26 years¹¹. His *successor* Niramitra enjoyed the earth 40 years¹² and went to heaven. Sukṣatra¹³ obtained the earth 56 years. Bṛhatkarman¹⁴ reigned 23 years.

Senājit¹⁵ is now enjoying the earth the same number of years¹⁶.

Śrutañjaya will be for 40 years, great in strength, large of arm, great in mind and prowess. Vibhu will obtain the earth 28 years¹⁷; and Śuci will stand in the kingdom 58 years. King Kṣema will enjoy the earth 28 years. Valiant Suvrata¹⁸ will obtain the kingdom 64 years. Sunetra will enjoy the earth 35 years¹⁹ (*or*

¹ Mt calls him *Sumitra* also.

² Mt, Vṣ, Bh *Bṛhadrāja*. Vā *Bharadvāja*.

³ Mt *crp*.

⁴ Gr *Dhanastraya*. Vā aptly inserts a king *Vrāta* before him.

⁵ Vṣ *Kruddhodana*.

⁶ Vṣ *Rātula*. Gr *Bāhula*. Bh *Lāṅgala*. Mt *Puskala*.

⁷ Gr *Senājit*.

⁸ Vā *Kṣulika*. Vṣ *Kuṇḍaka*. Gr *Kuḍava*. Bh *Ranaka*.

⁹ Bḍ, some Vṣ, Gr *Somāpi*. Vṣ genly *Somāni*. Bh *Mārjari*.

¹⁰ Vṣ *Śrutavat*. Bḍ, many Vā, 67 years.

¹¹ Mt *Apratipin*. Mt, some Vā, 36 years.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 100 years.

¹³ Vā *Sukṛta*. Mt *Surakṣa*. Bh *Suna-kṣatra*.

¹⁴ Bh *Bṛhatsena*. Gr *Bahukarmaka*.

¹⁵ Bh *Karmajit*.

¹⁶ That is, 23 years. Mt, 50.

¹⁷ Vṣ, Bh *Vipra*. Vā, Bḍ merely *nṛpa*, and say 35 years.

¹⁸ Vā genly *Bhuvata*. Mt *Anuvrata*.

¹⁹ Some Mt, 25 years.

Dharmanetra¹ will be 5 full years). And Nirvṛti² will enjoy this earth 58 years. Trinetra will next enjoy the kingdom 28 years (or Suśrama's³ sovereignty will last 38 years). Dr̥ghasena will be 48 years⁴. Mahānetra⁵ will be resplendent 33 years (or Sumati will next obtain the kingdom 33 years). Sucala will be king 32 years⁶. King Sunetra⁷ will next enjoy the kingdom 40 years. King Satyajit will enjoy the earth 83 years⁸. And Viśvajit will obtain this earth and be 25 years⁹. Ripuñjaya¹⁰ will obtain the earth 50 years.

These 16 kings are to be known as the future Bṛhadrathas; and their kingdom will last 723 years¹¹. And these 32 kings are the future Bṛhadrathas; their kingdom will last full 1000 years indeed.

Pradyotas.

When the Bṛhadrathas, Vītihoṭras and Ayantis have passed away, Pulika¹² will kill his master and anoint his own son Pradyota, by force¹³ in the very sight of the kṣatriyas. He (Pradyota) will indeed have the neighbouring kings subject to him and be destitute of good policy¹⁴. He, an excellent man¹⁵, will be king 23 years. Pālaka will then be king 24 years¹⁶. Viśākhayūpa will be king 50 years¹⁷. Ajaka¹⁸ will have the kingdom 21 years¹⁹. His son Nandivardhana will be 20 years²⁰.

Those 5 kings after enjoying the earth 52 years perished²¹.

Those 5 sons, the Pradyotas, will endure 138 years²².

Śisunāgas.

Śisunāga will destroy all their prestige and will be king. Placing his son in Benares he will make Girivraja his own abode²³. Śisunāga will reign 40 years. His son Kākavarṇa will obtain the earth 36 years²⁴. Kṣemadharman will be king next 20 years²⁵. Kṣatraujas will obtain the earth 40 years²⁶. Vimbisāra will be

¹ Bh *Dharmasūtra*. Vṣ, Gr *Dharma*.

² Vā, Bḍ, merely *nṛpati*.

³ Bh *Śama*. Vā *Suvrata*.

⁴ Mt *Dymatsena*. Vā, Bḍ, 58 years, *erp*.

⁵ Some Mt, merely *Netra*.

⁶ Mt *Acala*. Vṣ, Bh, Gr *Subala*. Vā, 22 years; Bḍ, 40.

⁷ Vṣ *Sunīta*. Bh *Sunītha*. Gr *Nīta*.

⁸ Mt, 80 years.

⁹ Vā *Vīrajit*, 35 years.

¹⁰ Vā, Bḍ *Arīñjaya*. Gr *Iṣuñjaya*.

¹¹ See p. 17, note ¹⁰.

¹² Vā *Munika*. Vṣ *Sunika*. Bḍ, Bh *Sunaka*.

¹³ Or 'Pulika's offspring'. Mt has the

name *Bālaka* for Pradyota.

¹⁴ Or (some copies) 'will not act righteously'.

¹⁵ Or (some copies) 'sickly in mind'.

¹⁶ Mt, 28 years.

¹⁷ Mt, 53 years.

¹⁸ Bh *Rājaka*. Vṣ *Janaka*. Mt *Sūryaka*.

¹⁹ Vā, 31 years.

²⁰ Vā *Vartivardhana*. Mt, 30 years.

²¹ So Mt; some copies, 152 years.

²² So Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh.

²³ So Mt. Vā, Bḍ seem to mean the same.

²⁴ Vā *Śakavarṇa*. Mt, 26 years.

²⁵ Mt, 36 years.

²⁶ Bh *Kṣetrajña*. Mt *Kṣemajit*, 24 years.

king 28 years¹. Ajātaśatru will be king 25 years². Darśaka will be king 25 years³. After him Udayin⁴ will be king 33 years. That king will make as his capital on the earth Kusumapura on the south bank of the Ganges in his fourth year⁵. Nandivardhana will be king 40 years⁶. Mahānandin⁷ will be 43 years.

These will be the 10 Śaiśunāga kings⁸. The Śiśunāgas will endure 360 (or better, 163⁹) years, being kings with kṣatriya kinsfolk.

Early Contemporary Dynasties.

Contemporaneous with these *aforesaid* kings there will be other kings; all these *following* kings will endure an equal time: *namely*, 24 Aikṣvākus¹⁰, 27 Pañcālas¹¹, 24 kings of Kāśi, 28 Haihāyas¹², 32 Kaliṅgas, 25 Aśmakas, 36 Kurus¹³, 28 Maithilas, 23 Śūrasenas, and 20 Vīṭihotras. All these kings will endure the same time.

Nandas.

As son of Mahānandin by a śūdra woman will be born a king¹⁴, Mahāpadma (Nanda¹⁵), who will exterminate all kṣatriyas. Thereafter kings will be of śūdra origin. Mahāpadma will be sole monarch, bringing all under his sole sway¹⁶. He will be 88 years on the earth¹⁷. He will uproot all kṣatriyas¹⁸, being urged on by prospective fortune¹⁹. He will have 8 sons, of whom Sukalpa²⁰ will be the first; and they will be kings in succession to Mahāpadma for 12 years.

A brahman Kauṭilya will uproot them all; and, after they have enjoyed the earth 100 years, it will pass to the Mauryas.

¹ All vary in this name. Bḍ 38 years. After him Mt erroneously inserts the first two Kāṇvāyana kings: see *Kāṇvāyanas*, *infra*.

² Mt, 27 years.

³ Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh *Darbhaka*. Mt *Vamśaka*, 24 years.

⁴ Vṣ *Udayāśva*. Mt *Udāsīn*. Bh *Ajaya*.

⁵ This statement is in Vā, Bḍ.

⁶ Vā, 42 years.

⁷ Bḍ *Sahānandī*.

⁸ Many copies of Mt say 12, because of the mistake mentioned in note¹.

⁹ So Mt according to its real meaning aptly: corrupted by Bḍ and Bh to 360; by Vā and Vṣ to 362.

¹⁰ For their list, see p. 65.

¹¹ Vā, Bḍ, 25.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 24.

¹³ For their list, see p. 64, prob.

¹⁴ Mt says aptly, he will be 'born as a portion of Kali'. Vā and Bḍ say, he will be 'enveloped by Fate'.

¹⁵ So Vṣ and Bh.

¹⁶ Vṣ, Bh, 'his rule will be untransgressed'.

¹⁷ Vā, Bḍ, 'he will protect the earth 88 (or some copies, 28) years'.

¹⁸ Vṣ, Bh, 'like a second Paraśu-Rāma'.

¹⁹ Vā, Bḍ, 'urged on by predestination', aptly.

²⁰ Or *Sahalya*. Vṣ *Sumātya*. Bh *Sumālya*.

Mauryas.

Kauṭilya will anoint Candragupta as king in the realm. Candragupta will be king 24 years¹. Vindusāra will be king 25 years². Aśoka will be king 36 years. His son Kunāla will reign 8 years³.

Mt and eVā.

Kunāla's son Bandhupālita will enjoy the kingdom 8 years¹. Their grandson Daśona will reign 7 years⁴. His son Daśaratha will be king 8 years. His son Samprati will reign 9 years. Śālīsūka will be king 13 years⁵. Devadharman will be king 7 years⁶. His son Śata-dhanvan will be king 8 years⁶. Bṛhad-ratha will reign 70 years⁸.

These are the 10 Mauryas⁹ who will enjoy the earth full 137 years. After them it will go to the Śuṅgas¹⁰.

Vā genly and Bḍ.

Kunāla's son Bandhupālita will enjoy the kingdom 8 years. Bandhupālita's heir Indrapālita will reign 10 years.

Devavarman will be king 7 years. His son Śatadhanus will be king 8 years. Bṛhadratha will be king 7 years⁷.

These 9 Mauryas will enjoy the earth full 137 years. After them will go the Śuṅga¹¹.

Śuṅgas.

Puṣyamitra the commander-in-chief will uproot Bṛhadratha and will rule the kingdom as king 36 years¹². His son Agnimitra will be king 8 years. Vasujyeṣṭha¹³ will be king 7 years. His son Vasumitra will be king 10 years. Then his son Andhraka¹⁴ will reign 2 years. Pulindaka will then reign 3 years. His son Ghoṣa¹⁵ will be king 3 years. Next Vajramitra will be king 9 years¹⁶. Bhāgavata¹⁷ will be king 32 years. His son Devabhūmi¹⁸ will reign 10 years.

These 10 Śuṅga kings will enjoy this earth full 112 years. From them the earth will pass to the Kaṇvas.

¹ Mt wants this statement.

² Mt omits. All except Vṣ vary this name.

³ Mt omits. Vṣ, Bh mention *Suyasās* instead.

⁴ Mt, 'his (i.e. Aśoka's) grandson', but the text is crp.

⁵ Mt wants this statement.

⁶ So also Vṣ, Bh: *eVā Śatadhanus*. Mt, 6 years.

⁷ Vā *Vṛhadakra*, but *Vṛhadratha* at beginning of next dynasty.

⁸ So Mt genly; *eVā*, 87.

⁹ So also Vṣ, Bh: *eVā*, 9.

¹⁰ But *eVā*, 'after them will be the Śuṅga'.

¹¹ Or, 'the earth will go to the Śuṅgas'.

¹² Vā, Bḍ, 60 years.

¹³ Vā, Bḍ, Vṣ, Bh *Sujyeṣṭha*.

¹⁴ Mt *Antaka*. Bḍ, Bh *Bhadra-ka*. Vṣ *Ādraka*.

¹⁵ Vṣ *Ghoṣavasu*. Mt crp *Yomegha*.

¹⁶ Bḍ, 7 years. Vā no term.

¹⁷ Mt *Samābhāga* aptly, but text crp.

¹⁸ Vā *Kṣemabhūmi* here, but *Devabhūmi* in next dynasty.

Kāṇvāyanas (Śuṅgabhr̥tyas).

The minister Vasudeva, forcibly overthrowing the dissolute king Devabhūmi because of his youth, will become king among the Śuṅgas¹. He, the Kāṇvāyana, will be king 9 years². His son Bhūmimitra will reign 14 years³. His son Nārāyaṇa will reign 12 years. His son Suśarman will reign 10 years⁴.

These are remembered as the Śuṅgabhr̥tya Kāṇvāyana kings. These 4 Kāṇva brahmans will enjoy the earth; for 45 years they will enjoy this earth. They will have the neighbouring kings in subjection and will be righteous. In succession to them the earth will pass to the Andhras.

Andhras.

The Andhra Simuka⁵ with his fellow tribesmen, the servants of Suśarman, will assail the Kāṇvāyanas and him (Suśarman), and destroy the remains of the Śuṅgas' power and will obtain this earth. Simuka will be king 23 years. His younger brother Kṛṣṇa will next reign 10 years⁶. His son Śrī-Śātakarṇi will reign 10 years⁷. Then Pūrṇotsaṅga will be king 18 years⁸. Skandhastambhi will be king 18 years⁸. Śātakarṇi will reign 56 years; his son Lambodara 18 years⁸. His son Āpilaka⁹ will reign 12 years. Meghasvāti will reign 18 years⁸. Svāti will be king 18 years¹⁰. Skandasvāti will be king 7 years⁸. Mṛgendra Svātikarṇa will reign 3 years⁸. Kuntala Svātikarṇa will be king 8 years⁸. Svātivarṇa will be king one year⁸. Pulomāvi will reign 36 years¹¹. Ariṣṭakarṇa¹² will reign 25 years. Then Hāla will be king 5 years¹³. Mantalaka¹⁴ will be a powerful king 5 years. Purikaṣeṇa will reign 21 years¹⁵. Sundara Śātakarṇi will reign one year. Cakora Śātakarṇi will reign 6 months. Śivasvāti will reign 28 years. King Gautamīputra will be king next 21 years. His son Pulomā¹⁶ will reign 28 years⁸. [Śātakarṇi will be king 29 years¹⁷.] Śivaśrī Pulomā¹⁸ will be king 7 years⁸. His son Śivaskandha Śātakarṇi will be king three¹⁹ years⁸. Yajñaśrī Śātakarṇika will reign 29 years²⁰.

¹ Mt, 'will become the Śaṅga king'.

² Bḍ, 5 years.

³ Vā, Bḍ, 24 years.

⁴ Bḍ, 4 years.

⁵ This is the name emended. Mt *Śisuka*. Vā, Bḍ *Sindhuka*. Vṣ *Śipraka*.

⁶ Mt, 18 years.

⁷ Vā, Bḍ, no number.

⁸ This sentence is not in Vā genly nor Bḍ.

⁹ Much variation in this name.

¹⁰ Or *Āti*, 12 years. Not in Vā, Bḍ.

¹¹ Vā, Bḍ, 24 years. Much variation in

this name.

¹² Much variation in this name.

¹³ Vā, Bḍ, one year.

¹⁴ Or *Pattalaka*. Bḥ *Talaka*. Vā *Saptaka*.

¹⁵ Mt *Purīndrasena*, but no number.

¹⁶ Properly *Pulomāvi*.

¹⁷ A doubtful line found only in eVā.

¹⁸ Or 'after Puloma Śivaśrī'.

¹⁹ Conjectural emendation; no number mentioned.

²⁰ Vā, Bḍ, 19 years.

After him Vijaya will be king 6 years. His son Caṇḍaśrī Sātakarṇi will reign 10 years¹. Another² of them Pulomāvi will reign 7 years.

These 30 Andhra kings³ will enjoy the earth 460 years⁴.

Various Local Dynasties.

When the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end *there will be* kings belonging to the lineage of their servants: 7 Āndhras⁵, and 10 Ābhīra kings; also 7 Gardabhins⁶, 18 Śakas⁷. There will be 8 Yavanas, 14⁸ Tuṣāras⁸, 13 Muruṇḍas⁹, 11 Maunas¹⁰.

The Śrīparvatīya Āndhras will endure 52 years¹¹; the 10 Ābhīra kings 67 years; the 7 Gardabhins will enjoy the earth 72 years¹²; the 18 Śakas¹³ 183 years. The 8 Yavanas¹³ will enjoy this earth 87 years¹⁴. The earth is remembered as belonging to the Tuṣāras 7000 years¹⁵. The 13 future Muruṇḍas¹⁶ along with low caste men, *all* of Mleccha origin, will enjoy it half 400 years¹⁷. The 11 Maunas will enjoy it 103 years¹⁸. When they are overthrown by Time there will be Kilakila kings¹⁹.

Then after the Kilakilas Vindhyaśakti²⁰ will reign. He will enter upon the earth after it has known *those kings* 96 years²¹.

Dynasties of Vidiśā, &c.

Hear also the future kings of Vidiśā. Bhogin, son of the Nāga king Seṣa, will be king, conqueror of his enemies' cities²², a king who will exalt the Nāga family. Sadācandra²³, and Candrānśa *who will be* a second Nakhavant²⁴, then Dhanadharman²⁵,

¹ Vā, Bḍ *Daṇḍaśrī*, 3 years.

² Or 'the last'.

³ Mt, 19.

⁴ Bḍ, 456; Vā crp, but apptly the same.

⁵ Bh and Vṣ *Andhra-bhṛtyas*.

⁶ Or *Gardabhilas*.

⁷ Vā, Bḍ, 10. Bh, Vṣ, 16. Bh calls them *Kaṅkas*.

⁸ Or *Tukhūras* or *Tuṣkaras*.

⁹ Mt, Bḍ, Bh *Guruṇḍas*. Vṣ *Muruṇḍas* (for *Muruṇḍas*).

¹⁰ Vā genly, 18. Mt, 19 *Hūnas*.

¹¹ Or possibly 'twice 50'. Vā, Bḍ crp but probably 112 or 102.

¹² Mt *Gardabhilas*, but no term.

¹³ Vā and Bḍ no number.

¹⁴ Vā and Bḍ, 82.

¹⁵ Vā, Bḍ, 500; but prob 107 and 105 are meant respectively.

¹⁶ See note⁹.

¹⁷ That is, 200 years; Vṣ, Bh say 199. Vā, Bḍ erroneously, 350.

¹⁸ Mt *Hūnas*.

¹⁹ Vṣ says they were Yavanas.

²⁰ Vṣ says he was a Kilakila.

²¹ This seems to be the meaning; but literally, 'he after having known 96 years will enter upon the earth'. But perhaps *samēgyati* may mean 'he will come to an end' (= *samsthāsyati*, see p. 8, note²³), for, though *sam-i* does not have that meaning, yet *samaya* has it. The sentence would then be, 'After having known the earth 96 years he will come to his end.'

²² Vṣ treats the word *purāṇjaya* as his name.

²³ Vṣ *Rāmacandra*.

²⁴ Or 'Nakhapāna's offspring' in *eVā*.

²⁵ Vṣ *Dharma*.

and Vaṅgara ¹ is remembered as the fourth. Then Bhūtinanda will reign in the Vaidīśa kingdom.

When the family of the Śuṅgas ² ends, Śiśunandi ³ will reign. His younger brother was named Nandiyāśas ⁴. In his lineage there will be 3 kings. His daughter's son named Śiśuka was king in Purikā.

Vindhyāśakti's valiant son, named Pravīra, will enjoy the city Kāñcanakā 60 years, and will sacrifice with vājapeya sacrifices replete with choice largesse. His 4 sons will be kings.

Dynasties of the Third Century, A.D.

When the family of the Vindhyakas has passed away, there will be 3 Bāhlika kings. Suprutika and Nabhīra ⁵ will enjoy the earth 30 years. Śakyamāna ⁶ was king of the Mahiṣis. There will be 13 Puṣyamitras ⁷ and Paṭumitras ⁸. In Mekalā 7 kings ⁹ will reign 70 years. In Kosalā there will be 9 very powerful and wise kings celebrated as 'Meghas'. All the kings of Niṣadha ¹⁰, born in the family of Nala, valiant and very powerful, will exist till the termination of the Manus ¹¹.

• Of the Māgadhas the king will be very valiant Viśvasphāpi ¹². Overthrowing all kings he will make other castes kings, namely, Kaivartas, Pañcakas ¹³, Pulindas, and brahmans. He will establish those persons as kings in various countries. Viśvasphāpi the magnificent will be mighty, Viṣṇu's peer in battle ¹⁴. King Viśvasphāpi is called eunuch-like in appearance. Overthrowing the kṣatriya caste he will create another kṣatriya caste. After gratifying the gods, the pitrs and brahmans once and again, he will resort to the bank of the Ganges and subdue his body; after resigning his body he will go to Indra's world.

Contemporary Dynasties of the Early Fourth Century.

Nine Nāka ¹⁵ kings will enjoy the city Campāvati; and 7 Nāgas will enjoy the charming city Mathurā. Kings born of the Gupta race will enjoy all these territories, namely, along the Ganges, Prayāga, Sāketa, and the Magadhas. Kings born from Maṇidhānya ¹⁶ will enjoy all these territories, namely, the Naiṣadhas, Yadukas, Śaiśītas ¹⁷, and Kālatoyakas. The Devarakṣitas will enjoy the Kośalas, Andhras ¹⁸,

¹ Bh Vaṅgiri. Vṣ Varāṅga. Vā Viṃśaja. Bḍ, 'born in the race'.

² Many Vā Aṅgas.

³ Vṣ genly Suśinandi. Vā Madhvaṇḍ.

⁴ Bh Yaśonandi.

⁵ Bḍ Gabhīra.

⁶ Bḍ Śaṅkamāna.

⁷ Or Puṣpamitras. Bh names one of them as Durmitra.

⁸ Vṣ adds Padmamitras.

⁹ Bh says Andhras.

¹⁰ Bh calls them 'lords of Vaidūra' also.

¹¹ Or perhaps, 'as long as Manu's race'.

¹² Bh Viśvasphūrji. Vṣ Viśvasphatika.

¹³ Bḍ Madrakas. Vṣ Yadus. Bh both.

¹⁴ Bh says his city will be Padmavati.

¹⁵ So Vā; but Bḍ, Vṣ Nāgas.

¹⁶ Vṣ Maṇidhāra.

¹⁷ Or Śaiśījas or Śaiśikas. Vṣ Naimiṣikas.

¹⁸ Vṣ Odras.

and Paundras, the Tāmraliptas and coast-folk and the charming city Campā¹. Guha will protect all these territories, *namely*, the Kaliṅgas, Mahiṣas, and the inhabitants of the Mahendra mountains. He who is named Kanaka will enjoy Strirāṣṭra² and the Bhokṣyakas³. The Saurāṣṭras, Āvāntyas and Ābhīras, the Śūdras⁴, Arbudas and Mālavas⁵, *there* the kings will be outcaste dvijas and non-dvijas, mostly śūdras. Śūdras, outcaste dvijas and others, and Mlecchas destitute of Vedic holiness will enjoy the Sindhu's bank, the Candrabhāgā, Kauntī⁶ and the Kāśmīra realm.

All these kings will be contemporaneous, niggards in graciousness, untruthful, very irascible and unrighteous.

Evils of the Kali Age.

There will be Yavanas here by reason of religious feeling *or* ambition *or* plunder; they will not be kings solemnly anointed, but will follow evil customs by reason of the corruption of the age. Massacring women and children⁷ and killing one another, kings will enjoy the earth at the end of the Kali age. Kings of continual upstart races, falling as soon as they arise, will exist in succession through Fate. They will be destitute of righteousness, affection, *and* wealth. Mingled with them *will be* Ārya and Mleccha folk everywhere⁸: they prevail in turn; the population will perish.

Chronological and Astronomical Particulars.

All the Purāṇas.

When the moon and the sun and the constellation Tisya and Brhaspati shall come together in the same zodiacal sign, then may the Kṛta age be.

This is the entire series of genealogies which has been declared in due order—the kings who have passed away, and those who exist *now*, and those who are future.

Now from Mahāpadma's⁹ inauguration to Parikṣit's birth, this *interval* is indeed known as 1050 years¹⁰. Moreover in the interval which *elapsed* from the last Andhra king Pulomāvi to Mahāpadma—that interval *was* 836 years. An equal space of time *is still* future; subsequent *kings* beginning from the end of the

¹ Vṣ *Samudratatā-purī*.

² Or *Strirāṣṭra*.

³ Bḷ *Bhojakas*. Vṣ *Mūṣikas*.

⁴ Or *Śūras*.

⁵ Vṣ *Marubhūmi*.

⁶ Vṣ *Dārvikorvī* in various forms.

⁷ Bh adds 'cattle and brahmins'; and

says 'they will ravish other people's wives and riches'. Vṣ similarly.

⁸ Vṣ adds 'they will be audacious through royal support'.

⁹ Bḷ *Mahānanda*. Vṣ, Bh *Nanda*. Vā *Mahādeva*.

¹⁰ Vṣ, Bh, 1015 years.

Andhras are declared *therein*. They have been enumerated in the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa by śrutarṣis who knew the ancient stories.

The Great Bear¹ was situated equally with regard to the lunar constellation Puṣya² while Pratīpa³ was king. At the end of the Andhras, who will be in the 27th century afterwards, the cycle repeats itself⁴. In the circle of the lunar constellations, wherein the Great Bear revolves⁵, and which contains 27 constellations in its circumference⁶, the Great Bear remains 100 years in (*i.e.* conjoined with) each in turn. This is the Cycle of the Great Bear, and is remembered as being, according to divine reckoning, 6 divine months and 7 divine years. According to those constellations divine time proceeds by means of the Great Bear. The two front stars of the Great Bear, which are seen when risen at night⁷, the lunar constellation which is seen situated equally between them in the sky⁸, the Great Bear is to be known as conjoined with that constellation 100 years in the sky. This is the exposition of the conjunction of the lunar constellations and the Great Bear. The Great Bear was conjoined with the Maghās in Parikṣit's time 100 years. It will be in (*i.e.* conjoined with) the 24th constellation⁹ 100 years at the termination of the Andhras.

Viṣṇu and Bhāgarata.

The Great Bear was in (*i.e.* conjoined with) the Maghās in Parikṣit's time; then began the Kali age comprising 1200 divine years¹⁰. When the portion of the lord Viṣṇu, which was born in Vasudeva's family and named Kṛṣṇa, went to heaven, then the Kali age set in. As long as he touched the earth with his lotus-feet, so long the Kali age could not encompass the earth. When that portion of the eternal Viṣṇu had departed from earth to heaven, Dharma's son Yudhiṣṭhira with his younger brothers relinquished his kingdom. That Pāṇḍava, beholding the adverse omens when Kṛṣṇa had departed, performed Parikṣit's inauguration. When the Great Bear will pass from the Maghās to Pūrvā Āṣādhā, then, starting from Nanda¹¹, this Kali age will attain its magnitude.

¹ Called the 'Seven Rishis'.

² Or 'was in (*i.e.* conjoined with) Puṣya 100 years'. These readings are emendations, see p. 59, note ⁴⁰.

³ Ancestor of Parikṣit in the seventh degree, see JRAS, 1910, p. 28.

⁴ This statement read with the preceding statements would imply that some 814 years are allowed for the interval between Pratīpa and Parikṣit: thus Pratīpa to Parikṣit 814 years, Parikṣit to Mahāpadma Nanda 1050 years, Mahāpadma to the last Andhra king 836 years—total 2700 years. Thus the period from Pratīpa to the end of the Andhras comprised a complete cycle of the Great Bear, and then the cycle began again.

⁵ So Mt: explained in subsequent statements.

⁶ So Vā, Bḍ.

⁷ Or 'in the sky'; or 'in the northern region'.

⁸ That is, according to the commentators, 'the constellation which is situated equally on a line drawn south and north between the two front stars (the two Pointers) of the Great Bear'.

⁹ Apptly, either no. 24 in the order of reckoning the lunar constellations, or the 24th after the Maghās.

¹⁰ Including the twilight.

¹¹ That is, the Great Bear was conjoined with Pūrvā Āṣādhā in Mahāpadma Nanda's time.

All the Purāṇas.

On the very day, on which Kṛṣṇa departed to heaven, the Kali age arrived. Hear its reckoning. It is remembered by the wise, as computed according to human reckoning, to be 360,000 years¹ or 1000 divine years. Then the twilight sets in. When that is completely finished, the Kṛta age will then arrive.

¹ Mt, 460,000 years.

APPENDIX I

The Account was originally in Prakrit.

Proof is offered here of the statement made in the Introduction, § 15, that the Sanskrit account as it stands in the Matsya, Vāyu, and Brahmāṇḍa is a Sanskritized version of older Prakrit ślokaś, as indicated by these peculiarities: *first*, certain passages violate the śloka metre, whereas in Prakrit form they would satisfy the metre; *secondly*, certain Prakrit forms actually occur, especially where they are required by the metre, which the corresponding Sanskrit forms would violate; *thirdly*, Sanskrit words occur at times in defiance of syntax, whereas the corresponding Prakrit forms would make the construction correct; *fourthly*, mistaken Sanskritization of names and words; *fifthly*, the copious use of expletive particles; *sixthly*, irregular sandhi. Those three Purāṇas will be dealt with first, and along with them such portions also of the Bhāgavata and Viṣṇu as have preserved the old ślokaś uncondensed; but the main portions of these two Purāṇas consist almost entirely of a condensed redaction, and their character will be considered afterwards.

i. As an illustration of the first peculiarity, the Mt and Vā¹, when naming the last Paurava king, end the line thus (p. 7)—*Nirāmitrāt tu* (or *ca*) *Kṣemakah*, ‘after Nirāmitra was Kṣemaka’; where the *tu* or *ca* in the fifth syllable should be short but is long by position before *kṣ*. No one composing in Skt could end a śloka line with *Kṣemaka*, but its Pkt form *Khemaka* satisfies the metre perfectly. There can be no doubt therefore that this line was composed in Pkt originally, and that the Skt redactor restored the Pkt name to its Skt form and in so doing overlooked the fact that the change violated the metre. The fault was however noticed afterwards, because *eVā* corrects it by altering the half line to *bhavitā Kṣemakas tathā* (p. 7, note ⁷¹). Precisely similar is the mistake in the line that ends with *saṃā bhokṣyanti trīṃśatīm*², where no difficulty would occur in Pkt since *trīṃśatī* would drop its *r* there³.

Again the Mt reads at the end of a śloka line, *aṣṭāvīṃśatir Haihayāḥ*⁴, where the fifth syllable is long by position contrary to rule; and here the literary Pkt form *vīśatī* without a termination would fit the metre. The Vā and Bḍ read instead *caturvīṃśat* (or *-vīṃśas*) *tu Haihayāḥ* and avoid the irregularity by reducing *vīṃśatī*

¹ The Bḍ has lost this line in a large lacuna.

² P. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2; the differences of reading there do not affect this point.

³ The phrase *ā-Manu-kṣayāt* in the Vā and Bḍ at the end of a line (p. 51, l. 8) does

not militate against this view, because the *kṣ* in the middle of this expression would have been *kkh* in Pkt.

⁴ P. 23, l. 4: *bMt* avoids the fault by reading *aṣṭāvīṃśatī*, keeping as near to Pkt as possible.

to *vinśat* or *vinśa* and replacing the lost syllable by a superfluous *tu*, which is the nearest approach to it. This expedient is very common as will be seen in the notes.

Next may be cited cases where a half line has a syllable too much, which would disappear in Pkt, and the significance of these cases lies in the fact that the superfluity was unnecessary since good Skt equivalents were available, if the verse had been composed directly in Skt. Thus the Bh has a śloka prophesying Viṣṇu's incarnation as Kalki thus—

dharma-trāṇāya sattvena Bhagavān avatariṣyati ¹.

The second half line has a syllable too much, but the Pkt verb *otarissati* would exactly suit the metre and was no doubt the word used originally, as dBh (an old MS of 1407) shows by reading *Bhagarān vatarisṣyati*, where *n* and *v* are separate letters. Many two-syllabled equivalents for *bhagavān* were available to suit the metre. Again eVā has for the first half of a line, *saṃpā varṇaṇi Devadharmū* ², where *varṇaṇi* is obviously a misreading of *varṇāni*, and there is a syllable too much; but the Pkt form *varṣā* or *vassā* satisfies the metre. To one composing in Skt *samāh* would have avoided all difficulty. Similarly bMt has the first half of a line, *aṣṭāvimsati tathā varṣā* with a syllable too much ³, but the Pkt *aṭṭhāvimsaṃ* would rectify the metre; whereas one composing in Skt could have written simply *aṣṭāvimsati-varṣāni*, which is indeed the general reading of the Mt now. This instance may give us an insight into the process of Sanskritization, if, as the bMt reading suggests, the original Pkt was *aṭṭhāvimsaṃ tathā vassā*.

ii. Actual Pkt forms occur rather often. First may be cited the Vā and Bḍ line ⁴—

sthāpayiṣyati rājāno nānā-deśeṣu te janā :

where *rājāno* and *te janā* are Pkt accusatives after the verb. They were misunderstood as nominatives, and the verb was altered to the plural in all copies of the Vā except eVā, and in the Bḍ. Similarly the Bh introduces the Bārhadratha dynasty with the old line ⁵—

atha Māgadha-rājāno bhavitāro vadāmi te.

Here *rājāno* and *bhavitāro* are accusatives, hence the line is not Skt but is actually good Pali. BrBh correct the faults by altering *bhavitāro* to *bhāvino ye*. Again the Mt has a half line *prasahya hy avanīm nṛpaḥ* in many copies, and *prasahya vyasanīm nṛpam* in some copies, while the corresponding reading of the Vā and Bḍ is *bālyād vyasaninām nṛpam* ⁶. The Mt reading should evidently be *prasahya vyasanīm nṛpam*, and points to a Pkt original something like *pasajjha* (or *pasayha*) *vasanīm* ⁷ *napam*; but this when Sanskritized became *prasahya vyasaninām nṛpam* with a syllable too much, and so was adjusted in two ways, (1) the half-Pkt form *vyasanīm* was used as an accus. in many copies and became corrupted to *hy avanīm*; or (2) the half line was emended to *prasahya vyasanātūram* in some copies. The Vā and Bḍ may have substituted *bālyād* (or *balād*?) for *prasahya* to rectify the metre.

Next may be cited a number of actual Pkt or half-Pkt words. All such forms cannot be deemed original, because the copyists, who were not always sufficiently literate, did write Pkt forms sometimes instead of Skt forms, but such deviations are

¹ Bh xii, 2, 16; omitted from p. 57.

² P. 29, l. 11, and note ³⁶.

³ P. 19, note ²⁶.

⁴ P. 52, l. 13 and notes.

⁵ P. 14, note ¹.

⁶ P. 33, note ².

⁷ This would be the correct accus. in Pkt, see Pischel's Prukrit Grammar, § 405.

trivial and obvious mistakes¹. It is different however when the Pkt forms violate grammar or sandhi, or suit the metre, and such are these—*uccādayitrā* (p. 53, note²), *mahāyaśāḥ* as a nomin. plural² (p. 51, note²⁵) and *varṣā* (see p. 78). There are also instances of the Pkt genit. plural in *āna* (p. 35, note⁴¹), and of its blending with *ante* into *ānānte*, namely *kulānānte* (p. 50, note²) and *Aulhrānānte* (p. 59, notes^{51, 54}; p. 61, note⁹²). Other words appear to be Pkt survivals and not copyists' errors, such as *aṭṭitriṃśat* (p. 19, note⁴¹), *athūchādya* (p. 34, note³), *teṣūchannesu* (p. 48, note⁸²), *samā* for *samās* before *tasmat* in Vā genly (p. 34, note¹⁸), and *Aśakāḥ* in Vā and Bḍ (p. 24, note¹⁵). In an old verse Bḥ has *papaṇṇān uharisṣati* (p. 26, note³⁰), which seems more than a mere clerical error. Mistakes precisely like these are found in Buddhist Skt.

The Bhāgavata has an old verse—

yasmin Kṛṣṇo divaṃ yātas tasminn eva tadāhani
pratipannam Kaliyugam iti prāhuḥ purāvidah.

The Mt, Vā, Bḍ, and Vṣ all have this verse, but read the last half line *tasya saṅkhyām nibodhata* or in equivalent words³. The Bḥ reading appears to be the oldest version, because its verse is complete in itself and is obviously an old saying, whereas the last half line in the other authorities was evidently substituted to connect this statement with the following verse when this collective account was drawn up: the reverse is hardly credible. Further, one old Bḥ MS (Bḥ, dated 1407) reads *iti-r-āhuḥ purāvidah*, and this with its euphonic Pkt *r* is no doubt the original form, which in the process of Sanskritization was amended to *iti prāhuḥ* as in all the other Bḥ copies; here also the reverse is hardly credible. *Iti-r-āhuḥ* is the Pkt *iti-r-āhu*⁴. There are one or two other instances of an *r* inserted, which seems to be euphonic⁵; and it may possibly be that the final *r* in the nominatives of numerals is sometimes as much a euphonic Pkt *r* as a Skt *r* by sandhi⁶.

Similarly no doubt are to be explained the Bḍ reading of p. 62, l. 40 and the Vā readings in note³¹ thereto. The reading in literary Pkt would have been something like *vassāna uccate Kali* or rather *vassāna-r-uccate Kali*. Turned into Skt, *varṣāṇām ucyate Kalīḥ* was good and sufficient, yet notwithstanding, the desire for an expedient to prevent the hiatus persisted in the Sanskritization, for *mVā* has preserved the euphonic *r*, and *bḍḍyVā* inserted *tu* instead. These were no doubt the original forms of the Sanskritizations, but it was perceived that no such expedient was wanted, hence most copies of the Vā dropped it. The reverse is not credible.

Most common is the use of numerals with the Pkt freedom from case-terminations, as well as only half Sanskritized, such as—*aṣṭāṣṭi* and *aṣṭāṣṭi*⁷, and *vimśati* often both in the text and in the notes. Some of these instances might be due to the carelessness of copyists in omitting visarga or anusvāra, but that does not account for all such peculiarities, since they are found in carefully written MSS and are sometimes obligatory for the sake of the metre. Thus the Vā and Bḍ read as the last half line of a śloka, *aṣṭāvimśati Maithilāḥ*⁸, and this was no doubt the

¹ E.g. see p. 2, note¹⁸; p. 43, note²⁷: and these are found even in Bḥ MSS, see p. 46, note²⁷.

² This is possible only in Pkt and does actually occur, see Pischel, *op. cit.* § 409.

³ P. 62, ll. 37, 38 and notes.

⁴ See Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, §§ 353, 518.

⁵ See *hatra-r* in p. 38, note².

⁶ As in p. 43, l. 36, where the accusative would be proper.

⁷ P. 25, l. 5 and note¹⁷.

⁸ P. 24, l. 6.

original reading because *fyMt* have it also; but the *Mt* has generally altered *vinśati* to *vinśās* (or *śat* or *śa*) *tu*. The Skt form *vinśatir* would violate the metre, and the *Mt* has avoided the difficulty of Sanskritization by substituting *tu* for the final syllable. This is the converse of the first irregularity noticed above (p. 78), and many similar instances of *tu* substituted for a final *ti* will be found in the notes.

iii. Of the third class of peculiarities the following are instances. As the last half line of a śloka the *Vā* and *Bḍ* have in one place *varsāṇi bhavitā trayah*¹, and in another *taṣya putrah samās trayah*²; and the *Mt* has in another place *bhaviṣyati samās trayah*³. In all these passages grammatical concord is violated, because (1) these are accus. expressions denoting duration of time, and (2) *varsāṇi* is neuter, *samās* feminine, and *trayah* masculine and nomin.; but, if the Pkt *tao* be substituted for *trayah*, concord is established, because *tao* is both nomin. and accus. in all three genders⁴, and the metre also is satisfied. Such expressions could not have been composed in Skt originally. There can be no doubt that they were originally in Pkt and that, when the verses were Sanskritized, the exigencies of metre induced the redactor to convert *tao* into *trayah*, because the correct equivalents *trīṇi* and *tisrah* would not suit the metre⁵.

The same fault occurs in places where metre was not at stake. Thus all three *Purāṇas* read *catvāriṃśat trayas caira* as the first half of a line⁶, where *samās* or *varsāṇi* is implied and *trayas* is wrong as regards both gender and case. *CVā* attempts to rectify the discord by reading *trayam*. Similarly in another passage the *Mt* has *samās trīṇy evaṃ*, while the *Vā* and *Bḍ* read *samās tisra eva*⁷. It is impossible to suppose that these wrong expressions were composed originally in Skt, and they are intelligible as perfunctory Sanskritizations of Pkt expressions containing the numeral *tao*, or *tiṇi* which also is of all three genders⁸. Similarly we find the phrase *ṣaṣṭy-uttara-kūta-trayam* used with *varsāṇi* in the *Bḍ* and with *samāh* in the *Bh*⁹. Other instances are *saptasāṣṭis tu varsāṇi*¹⁰, and *aṣṭāśitis tu varsāṇi*¹¹, where the case is wrong; *ye cānye Mleccha-jālayah*¹² which *eVā* has corrected to *yās cānyā*¹³; and perhaps *divyābdāni*¹⁴ where the correct *divyābdās* was as easy as in the *Bḍ*.

iv. Some forms of names look strange as Skt but are readily intelligible if they are mistaken Sanskritizations of Pkt forms. Thus the name *Śiśunāga* as found in the *Bḍ*, *Vś*, and *Bh* appears as *Śiśunāka* in the *Mt* and *Vā*¹⁴. *Śiśunāga* as Pkt might naturally be Sanskritized as *Śiśunāka*, because a Pkt *g* often represents a Skt *k*: otherwise it is difficult to see how the form *Śiśunāka* could have arisen. Similarly *eVā* has *Śuṅka* and *Śuṅka* for *Śuṅga*¹⁵; *eka-kṣatro* appears instead of *eka-cchatro*, and *eka-kṣa'rām* instead of *eka-cchatrām*¹⁶.

¹ P. 32, l. 8. The *Mt* reads correctly *trīṇi varsāṇi*.

² P. 43, l. 32. The *Mt* reads differently, *samā daśa*.

³ P. 40, l. 15. The *Vā* and *Bḍ* omit this, except *eVā* which alters it to *samā-trayam*.

⁴ Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 438.

⁵ Unless he recast the line, which was obviously not attempted, except by *Mt* in the first instance, see note¹.

⁶ P. 22, l. 14 and notes.

⁷ P. 32, l. 7; but *dfjymMt* alter it to *tisro vai*.

⁸ Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 438.

⁹ P. 22, note⁴⁶.

¹⁰ P. 46, l. 7.

¹¹ P. 25, note¹⁷.

¹² P. 3, l. 11 and note⁵⁷.

¹³ P. 60, l. 16 and note⁷⁰.

¹⁴ P. 21, ll. 1, 3; p. 22, ll. 15, 17; and notes thereto.

¹⁵ P. 30, note⁵⁰; p. 32, note⁴⁷; p. 49, note¹⁷.

¹⁶ P. 25, l. 4 and notes^{14, 15}.

In this class may be mentioned certain incorrect forms : thus the Vā generally reads *caturas* instead of *catvāras* in p. 34, l. 7 (note ²⁰), where the Pkt *caūro* may have been used as a nomin. though it is strictly accus.¹ So the Mt generally has *catvārimsad* instead of *catvāras ca* (or *tu*), which would be an intelligible mistake if the Pkt was *cattāri ca*, for *cattāri* though neuter was often used as masculine². The plural verb *bhokṣyanti* instead of the dual in p. 50 (*Dynasties of the 3rd Cent.*), l. 2, would be correct in Pkt but not in Skt.

Vernacular names had to be Sanskritized and so developed strange forms ; compare for instance *Simuku* in p. 38, note ¹⁷, and other Andhra names.

Attention may also be drawn to p. 59, l. 11, where all the divergent readings are obviously attempts to Sanskritize one and the same original Pkt statement that was puzzling.

v. The fifth class of peculiarities is a very noticeable feature of these texts, namely, the copious use of particles as mere expletives, such as *tu*, *hi*, *ca*, *vai*, &c., and especially *tu*. The lines in which two such particles occur are too numerous to be mentioned, but three and even four are sometimes found in a single line, and the following lines are cited as most illustrative :—

bhavitā cāpi Sujyeṣṭhaḥ sapta varṣāni vai tataḥ³
 Svātīś ca bhavitā rājā samās tv aṣṭādaśaiva tu⁴
 Śivaśrīr vai Pulomā tu saptaiva bhavitā nṛpaḥ⁵
 sapta Gardabhinaś cāpi tato 'tha daśa vai Śakāḥ⁶
 trayodaśa Muruṇḍās ca Maunā hy ekādaśaiva tu⁷
 saptaṣaṣṭis tu varṣāni daś Ābhīrās tathaiva ca⁸
 śatāni trīṇy aṣṭīm ca Śakā hy aṣṭādaśaiva tu⁹
 Pulomās tu tath Āndhrās tu Mahāpadmāntare punaḥ¹⁰.

One cannot imagine that these verses were composed originally either in Skt or in Pkt with so many expletives, when the authors could easily have improved their verses by employing appropriate words denoting 'reign' or 'exist' or 'relationship'. No one composing in Skt would mar his verse and proclaim his literary poverty by such shifts ; but these blemishes are readily intelligible, if the verses were originally in Pkt as chronicles of the past and were converted into Skt prophecies. Future tenses are longer than past tenses, and if they could not be fitted into the place of the past tenses, it would have been natural to substitute expletives. Thus it may be conjectured that the second, fifth, sixth, and seventh lines ended originally with a past verb corresponding to *abhavat* or *abharan*. Again, Pkt forms are sometimes longer than their Skt equivalents, and the substitution of the latter would have been compensated for by adding an expletive ; thus in the third line *Śivaśrīr vai* no doubt stands for the Pkt *Śivasirī*, and in the eighth line *Pulomās tu tath Āndhrās tu* probably mean the ablat. case and stood originally something like *Pulomādo tath Āndhrādo*, or *Pulomamhā tath Āndhrāmhā*.

It has been noticed above (pp. 78, 80) that the particle *tu* is used sometimes to compensate for the loss of the final syllable of *viṃśati* and *triṃśati*. When the full forms of these words vitiated the metre, they were reduced sometimes to *viṃśat*

¹ Pischel's Prakrit Grammar, § 439.

² P. 35, note ²⁰. Pischel, § 439.

³ P. 31, l. 4, Vā and Bḍ.

⁴ P. 40, l. 13, Mt.

⁵ P. 42, l. 29, Mt and eVā.

⁶ P. 45, note ¹², Vā and Bḍ.

⁷ P. 46, l. 5, Vā and Bḍ.

⁸ P. 46, l. 7, Mt.

⁹ P. 46, l. 9, Mt.

¹⁰ P. 58, l. 7, Mt.

or *vimśa*, and *trīmśat* or *trīmśa* and the lost syllable was replaced by an expletive *tu*. This expedient is very common and many instances of it will be found in the notes. Indeed it is hardly too much to say that the occurrence of *tu* throughout the account, if not required by euphony (see next para.), almost certainly indicates a lost syllable, and in many cases *tu* in the Mt and *eVā* has been altered to *ca* in the Vā and Bḍ as an improvement. Other instances of compensatory expletives may be surmised in the notes, such as these—*Suseṇaś c-Āntarikṣaś ca* (p. 10, l. 13) is hardly explainable unless the second *ca* has replaced the lost syllable of the Pkt ablative; and *Dharminah sa* (p. 11, l. 15) no doubt stands instead of the Pkt genitive *Dharminassa*.

The use of expletives was however carried beyond necessary requirements, and they are often inserted merely to prevent two vowels from coming together, as *tv* in the second of the above-cited lines, and *hy* in the fifth and seventh lines. Skt sandhi did not require this device, but it is intelligible in Pkt. This superfluity is found in the Bh also, where it has not condensed the older ślokas, as in *sūdra-prāyās tv adhārmikāḥ* (p. 25, l. 3).

vi. The instances of irregular sandhi may be divided into two classes; *first*, those in which the form it takes resembles Pkt sandhi and is unnecessary, because regular Skt sandhi would have been proper and sufficient; and *secondly*, those in which it consists of double sandhi in order to contract the words for the metre.

Of the first class may be cited *varṣāṇi 'kūrayat* instead of *varṣāṇy akūrayat* (p. 15, note ²⁹); *trīṇi 'sitiś for trīṇy aśitiś* (p. 46, note ⁴⁸); *Daśarathāśtau* instead of *Daśaratho 'śtau* (p. 28, note ⁵); and *Agnimitrāśtau* for *Agnimitro 'śtau* (p. 31, note ¹⁰). Such sandhi can be explained through Pkt, and it is difficult to understand how any one composing in Skt could have adopted it; nor is it probable as a copyist's error.

The second class is commoner, and we find—*bhaviṣyāśtau* for *bhaviṣyāḥ aśtau* (p. 5, l. 10); *bhaviṣyōdayanaś* for *bhaviṣyāḥ Udayanaś* (p. 7, l. 23); *Yavanāśtau* for *Yavanāḥ aśtau* (p. 45, l. 4; p. 47, l. 10); and *bhāvyaśtau* for *bhāvyaḥ aśtau* (p. 47, l. 13). Here ordinary sandhi would have given a superfluous syllable, and the double sandhi rectifies the metre; but the significance of it is that it was easily avoidable in Skt, because the first two phrases might have been written *bhāvino 'śtau* and *bhavit-ōdayanaś*. The simplest explanation seems to be, that the conversion of the Pkt past tense into the Skt future was made perfunctorily, and overloaded the verse with a superfluous syllable which was adjusted by the double sandhi. The third phrase would have been *Yonā aśtau* in Pkt, and the Sanskritization of *Yonā* into *Yavanāḥ* produced the difficulty of the extra syllable. Attempts at improvement were made; see p. 45, note ¹⁶. There are many similar instances, such as *atātāśtau* and *atātāśtau* (p. 34, notes ³, ⁵); *atātāśtau* and *atātāśtau* (p. 38, note ⁴).

Crisis of this kind is ordinarily explained as *ārṣa-sandhi*, but this explanation is manifestly untenable here ¹. All these irregularities are readily intelligible on the two suppositions, that Pkt words were converted into their Skt equivalents, and that past tenses were changed to futures, with the metrical difficulties that naturally ensued.

vii. All these peculiarities are found in the Mt, Vā, and Bḍ throughout, and show that their version must have been composed originally in Pkt ślokas and that the ślokas were Sanskritized for incorporation in the Bhaviṣya, from which the Mt

¹ In the Purāṇas what is called *ārṣa-sandhi* is really Prakrit sandhi; see p. 20, note ².

and Vā confessedly, and the Bḍ impliedly, borrowed their accounts (see Introdn. §7). The Prakritisms which have been cited are not mere casual variations, for such might be due to the ignorance or carelessness of copyists, but have an important *raison d'être* in the verse in many cases. The same conclusion holds good for the Vṣ and Bh in the passages where they have preserved the old śloka form.

viii. The main part of the Viṣṇu account is in prose and, not being affected by the exigencies of metre, runs in ordinary Skt, and displays no verbal peculiarities. It contains the same matter found in the Vā and Bḍ but in a condensed shape, and closes its account where they end, so that it must have been composed directly in Skt from them or their original, the revised version in the Bhaviṣya, for it is not probable that its account was a new and independent compilation, when the compilations in those Purāṇas were available. A difference may be noticed in its account to this extent that the dynastic matter is generally narrated in curt sentences, often without regard for sandhi¹, and that the subsequent matter of the evils of the Kali age is in ordinary good prose Skt with a predilection for compound phrases. Hence it would seem that the dynastic portion was an earlier and somewhat crude condensation, and that the latter portion was an addition made with regard to the canons of good prose.

ix. The Bhāgavata account, which is mainly a condensation, is evidently a later redaction. Peculiarities of the kinds noticed above do not appear therein, but it is in good Sanskrit, and phrases occur in it which indicate that it must have been composed directly in Skt. Two are especially significant. A śloka line ends with the words *ekādaka kṣitim* (p. 48, note⁷⁷), where the *sa* is long by position before *kṣ* as it should be, but would not have been long in Pkt in which *kṣ* would have become *kh*; so that this line must have been composed in Skt and not in Pkt. Similarly another line ends *iti śrutah* (p. 32, note⁴⁵), where the second *i* is long by position in Skt but would not have been so in Pkt.

x. The Garuḍa has no Prakritisms except in some of the names, and these are too uncertain a basis on which to argue, for those Prakritisms might be original or might be due to the carelessness of copyists, yet one name certainly seems somewhat suggestive². All that is clear is that its account is the last and concisest redaction, that it was probably composed afresh in Skt, and that it makes frequent use of the termination *ka* for the sake of the metre. Its treatment of the name Adhiśimakṛṣṇa suggests that it was composed from a bare list of kings, for it divides the name into two, *Adhiśima* + *ka* (ending one line) and *Ṛṣṇa* (beginning the next line)³—which seems inexplicable unless it had only a prose list and chopped the names up into groups for each line.

¹ As in p. 18, note⁷; p. 30, note⁴⁶; and in these curt sentences *tasyāpi Aśoka-varḍhanah*, *tataś ca Ariṣṭakarmā*, and *tasmāt Yajñaśrīh*.

² *Dṛdhasenaka* appears as *Datḥasenaka* in

abGr, which may be a faulty Sanskritization of the Pkt *Dadḥasena* + *ka*, though it might also be the form of that name in one kind of Pkt; see p. 16, note⁷⁵.

³ See p. 4, note¹⁰.

APPENDIX II

The Oldest Scripts used in the Account.

Mistakes are found in the MSS, which can, it seems, be only explained satisfactorily by supposing that they arose out of misreadings of the ancient scripts (see Introdn. § 26). Some mistakes are obviously mere clerical blunders, but others cannot be accounted for naturally in that way. Kharoṣṭhī being the oldest Indian script that we know of, mistakes that could be traced to misreadings of its letters would be most significant. Such instances may singly be open to some distrust, but collectively they would have cumulative force; and without pronouncing a positive opinion, it does yet seem to me that certain misreadings do point to Kharoṣṭhī as their source. Such mistakes may prevail in many MSS, if they passed undetected from the beginning; otherwise they may only occur in single MSS, having been corrected in all the others.

i. First may be cited an instance from the V_g, because it affords the best illustration of a misreading that seems significant, though the V_g does not contain the oldest version. It calls Aśoka generally Aśokavardhana, but kV_g has *Ayośokavardhan* (p. 28, note ²⁸). Here *yo* is obviously a misreading of *śo*; the copyist read the *śo* as *yo* and wrote *yo*, then he (or some one else) perceived the mistake and wrote or inserted *śo* in the copy, but the *yo* was not cancelled and the erroneous name *Ayośoka* remained and was repeated till it appears in kV_g. Now *śo* could not be mistakenly read as *yo* in any Indian script except Kharoṣṭhī, and in that *śo* and *yo* were often written so much alike, that it is very difficult at times to say merely from the shape which letter was meant. Hence it seems reasonably certain that this passage in the Viṣṇu must have been originally taken from a Kharoṣṭhī MS. Had this mistake occurred in verse, the extra syllable would probably have been detected and the error corrected, but there was no such check in the prose of the V_g, and the mistake might have been followed in one copy (from which was descended kV_g) though rectified in others.

Other misreadings of *ś* and *y* occur, namely—*Ayola* for *Aśoka* in lMt¹, where the second misreading of *k* as *l* might have arisen later in the Gupta script²; *Māgadhēso* in jMt³ where the more general readings are *Māgadhā ye*, *Māgadho yo* or *Māgadheya*; *Koyāla* in cgV_g⁴ for *Kośala*, where *yā* might easily be read for *śa* because Kharoṣṭhī often did not distinguish between long and short vowels; and *Śāliyūka* in eVū for *Śāliśūka*⁵; *Mauryā dayo daka* in lV_g⁶, where *daka* was probably first misread and written as *daya*, which was afterwards amended so as to read *Mauryādāyo* incorrectly.

ii. Some similar variations seem to point to the same conclusion. The Mt

¹ P. 27, note ³.

² See Bühler's Ind. Palaeog., Table IV, cols. xxi, xxiii, and Table V, cols. viii, ix.

³ P. 14, note ¹.

⁴ P. 54, note ²⁰. *Koyāla* is an error in writing, different from *Kojāla* which was

a variation of *Kauśalya* in pronunciation; see Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Orientalistes, Alger, 1905, p. 217.

⁵ P. 29, note ³⁷.

⁶ P. 30, note ⁴⁶.

reading, *Kāṣeyās*, appears in *djMt* as *Kāleyās*; and the mistake of *l* for *ś* seems best explainable by their similarity in Kharoṣṭhī. The *Vā* and *Bd* read *Kālakās*, which is probably a similar misreading of the equivalent name *Kāśakās*¹.

iii. Two other letters which might be confused in Kharoṣṭhī but not in any other script are *k* and *bh*, and there are some variations which seem to have so originated. The *Vā* generally, and the *Mt* sometimes, have *Tvūga* instead of *Śūga*², a misreading the cause of which is not clear³, but the name *Śvūgabhrtya* is generally corrupted to *Tvūgakṛtya* in the *Vā*, while *cVā* alone among the *Vā* MSS has preserved it nearly right as *Śvūgarṭya*⁴. Here it seems certain that *bh* was misread as *k* in a Kharoṣṭhī MS. The converse appears to be the cause of the faulty *Mt* reading in p 41, line 22, where *saumyo bhavisyati*, with no mention of the length of the reign, seems to be a misreading of the *Vā* and *Bd* reading *so 'py eka-vimśatiṃ*, for, while *saumyo* might be a later mistake and emendation for *so'pye*, *bhavisyati* could be a misreading of *ka-vimśati* in Kharoṣṭhī only. The two forms would be *bharissati* and *ka-risati* in Pali and probably also in literary Pkt, and these two would be almost identical in Kharoṣṭhī which generally wrote long and short vowels alike and doubled letters as single.

iv. As regards Brāhmī, I have not found any variations of importance which can be assigned definitely to misreadings of it, and there is not the same scope for detecting such errors, because there is more resemblance between Brāhmī and Gupta letters than between them and Kharoṣṭhī. All the mistakes that I have detected, which might be attributed to misreadings of Brāhmī letters, might equally well, or even better, be attributed to misreadings of Gupta letters. Hence it seems to me, speaking with diffidence, that no light is thrown by Brāhmī on the age of the account or the MSS, and that, so far as the negative argument is of weight, Brāhmī writing played no part in the early MSS of these dynastic accounts. If this be so, the accounts passed from Kharoṣṭhī into the Gupta script.

v. If these explanations of these variations be reasonable and not fanciful, it appears that the *Mt*, *Vā*, and *Vs* all betray the fact that their accounts were originally copied from MSS written in Kharoṣṭhī. This script was in use till A.D. 300, or perhaps even half a century later⁵. This conclusion would, as regards the *Mt* and *Vā*, agree with the period assigned to them⁶. There is no further indication regarding the date of the *Vs*, and as Kharoṣṭhī MSS would have lasted some centuries, the *Vs* account might well be later and yet have been extracted from such a MS. There has been no opportunity of testing the *Bd* account in this way, because I have not been able to collate any MS of it; and the printed edition betrays no misreadings of this kind; but it is so closely like the *Vā* that the same conclusion probably holds good for it.

vi. Nor have I found any variations in the Bhāgavata which point to misreadings of Kharoṣṭhī or even of Brāhmī. I have noticed only two peculiarities which may perhaps be significant.

In the list of Andhra kings Hāla was succeeded by a king whose name consisted of four syllables, the best supported forms of which are Mantalaka or

¹ P. 23, note ⁹.

² P. 32, note ⁴⁷; p. 33, note ⁶².

³ Perhaps through the Pkt form *Śūga*; *s* carelessly made might be read as *t* in Kharoṣṭhī. The mistake is ancient as it is

found so widely.

⁴ P. 34, note ²⁸; *rṛtya* might be a modern misreading of *kṛtya*.

⁵ JRAS, 1907, pp. 184-5.

⁶ See Introdn. §§ 21-24.

Pattalaka¹. The Bh calls them *Hāleya* and *Talaka* respectively, *Hāleya* ending the first half of a line and *Talaka* beginning the second half, thus:—

Aniṣṭakarmā Hāleyas Talakas tasya cātmajaḥ.

These two names seem to be mistakes for *Hāla* and *Pattalaka*, the *pa* being misread as *ya*. If so, the wrong division of these two names in the middle of a line seems only explicable on the supposition that the Bh prepared this verse from a bare prose list of kings and divided the letters of the two names incorrectly. If this suggestion has any validity, it would appear that the Bh could not have been composed till after the time when *y* approximated to *p* in shape, that is, after the 7th century A.D.

The other instance is the name of the Andhra king Āpīlaka, which appears in the Bh generally as *Civilaku*. The probable genesis of the changes in the name is suggested in p. 39, note ⁴⁵, and the fact that seems significant here is that the compiler of the Bh account apparently drew his information from a Vg account in which he misread the initial *d* as *c*. This mistake could arise only in the Gupta script and not very well before the 7th century A.D.²

APPENDIX III

Janamejaya's Dispute with the Brahmans.

The dispute between the Paurava king Janamejaya³ and Vaiśampāyana and other brahmans is narrated in *AMt* 50, 57^b–65 and *AVā* 99, 250–256 and gives us an instance of how the text was revised⁴. The *Mt* version, which is the oldest, says the king made a successful stand against them for some time, but afterwards gave in and, making his son king, departed to the forest (according to custom); but the *Vā* version has abridged the inconvenient verses, and says he perished and the brahmans made his son king. This alteration may have been made (1) either in the *Bhaviṣya* when it was revised, and so passed into the *Vāyu*⁵, or (2) in the *Vāyū* itself; but it is impossible to decide this point, because *eVā* and the *Bd*, which would have thrown much light on it, have unfortunately lost this passage in lacunae. What is clear is that a story of royal opposition to brahmanic claims was modified early in the 4th century A.D. to maintain brahmanic prestige.

As regards MSS, *bdlhpMt* omit l. 6, read l. 9 instead of it and omit l. 9 from its place; *cefjjuMt* omit l. 9; *kMt* ll. 9, 20; *lMt* ll. 6–9; *mMt* reads l. 9 instead of l. 6, as well as in its proper place; *a¹dhlVā* omit ll. 11–13; *lVā* ll. 11–13, 18–20; *kVā* ll. 14, 15; *lVā* ll. 16, 17; and *cfjmVā* want the whole.

¹ P. 41, l. 2.

² See Bühler's *Ind. Pal.*, Table IV.

³ See p. 4, l. 2.

⁴ See *Introdn.* §§ 24, 30.

⁵ See *Introdn.* § 23.

Matsya.

Janamejayaḥ Parīkṣitaḥ
putraḥ parama-dhārmikah¹
brahmāṇaṁ² kalpayāmāsa
sa vai³ vājasaneyakam⁴
sa⁵ Vaiśampāyanenaiva⁷
śaptaḥ⁹ kila¹⁰ maharṣiṇā
na sthāsyatīti¹² durbuddhe¹³
tavaitad vacanam, bhuvi
yūvat sthāsyasi tvaṁ loke¹⁴
tāvad eva¹⁶ prapatsyati¹⁶
kṣatrasya vijayaṁ jñātvā¹⁹
tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ
abhigamya sthitāś²⁰ caiva²¹
nṛpaṁ ca Janamejayam
tataḥ prabhṛti śāpena
kṣatriyasya tu yājinaḥ²⁵
utsannā²⁶ yājino²⁷ yājñe²⁸
tataḥ prabhṛti sarvaśaḥ
kṣatrasya²⁹ yājinaḥ³⁰ kecīc³¹
chāpāt³² tasya mahātmanah

Vāyu.

Parīkṣitas tu dāyādo
rājāsij Janamejayaḥ¹
brāhmaṇān kalpayāmāsa
sa vai vājasaneyikān⁵
asapat taṁ⁸ tadāmarṣād
Vaiśampāyana¹¹ eva tu
na sthāsyatīti durbuddhe
tavaitad vacanam bhuvi
yūvat sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loke
tāvan naitat¹⁷ praśasyate¹⁸ 5

abhitat²² samsthitaś²³ cāpi
tataḥ sa²⁴ Janamejayaḥ

10

¹ This is l. 2 on p. 4.

² In *fhMt* brāhmaṇaṁ, *jMt* brah°.

³ In *cnMt* makhe; *jMt* makham; *eMt* makha.

⁴ In *efgMt* °yikam; *kMt* °yake.

⁵ In *a°a°dhklVā* °yakān.

⁶ In *hMt* taṁ.

⁷ In *cejnMt* °yane caiva.

⁸ So *a°a°bdghlVā*. *Ca°kVā* asapatnaṁ.

⁹ In *benMt* saptaḥ; *hMt* śaptaṁ; *lMt* śapuh.

¹⁰ In *eMt* kali.

¹¹ So *Ca°lVā*: but *a°a°bdghklVā* °yanam.

¹² In *bdMt* °iti.

¹³ In *jMt* durbuddheḥ.

¹⁴ So *CGVa°a°Mt*: *lMt* vai loke; *enMt* loke tvaṁ; *a°a°kMt* loke °smin; *cMt* lokeṣu. But *bdghmpMt* sthāsyāmy ahaṁ loke, and *jMt* erply.

¹⁵ In *hMt* etat.

¹⁶ So *CGVa°a°Mt*; *mpMt* °paśyati; *eMt* °yaśyati; *dMt* °śatsyati; *jkMt* °vatsyati; *a°a°efghMt* °vatsyati; *nMt* °raśyati; *lMt* °vatsyasi.

¹⁷ In *a°Vā* naiva.

¹⁸ So *Ca°a°lVā*: but *a°a°yVā* prapatsyati; *bdhklVā* °paśyati.

¹⁹ In *fjJMt* jñātvān: *bdhmpMt* substitute l. 9 for this line; see note ²⁶.

²⁰ In *bdlefjJMt* sthitaś.

²¹ *Caivam* in *cenMt*.

²² In *bhVā* †pravṛ[ti]taḥ; *dVā* †pracittitaḥ.

²³ In *dhVā* sa sthitaś.

²⁴ In *hVā* †taka sa; *lVā* †takasaj; *dVā* †tak sa.

²⁵ In *cnMt* yājinaḥ; *bdgfjJmpMt* vājinaḥ; *hMt* rājinaḥ.

²⁶ So *ACMt*: *bdhmpMt* omit this line, see note ¹⁹, but *mMt* has it here also. In *bdMt* uchannā; *mMt* trasyannā above, *utsannā* here; *hMt* utkalasya.

²⁷ In *bdmpMt* vājino; *hMt* rāj°.

²⁸ In *dhmpMt* yājñe.

²⁹ In *lMt* kṣatra[ya]sya.

³⁰ In *lMt* yājinaḥ, *fjJMt* vāj°: *bdjJmpMt* vājinaḥ, *hMt* rāj°.

³¹ In *cenMt* kaścīc.

³² In *djMt* chāpām.

• *Maṣya.*

paurṇamāsenā ³³ haviṣā
 iṣṭvā tasmin ³⁴ prajāpatim
 sa ³⁵ Vaiśampāyanenaiva
 praviśan ³⁷ vāritas ³⁸ tataḥ ³⁹
 Parikṣitaḥ suto 'sau vai ⁴²
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya ⁴³
 mahā-vājasaneyakam ⁴⁴
 pravartayitvā tam sarvam ⁴⁶
 ṛṣir ⁴⁷ vājasaneyakam ⁴⁸

vivāde ⁵⁵ brāhmaṇaiḥ sūrdham
 abhīṣapto vanam yayau
 Janamejayāc Chatānikas
 tasmā jajāne sa vīryavān ⁵⁸
 Janamejayaḥ ⁵⁹ Śatānikam
 putram rāje 'bhiṣiktavān ⁶¹.

• *Vāyu.*

paurṇamāsyena haviṣā
 devam iṣṭvā prajāpatim
 vijñāya saṁsthito 'paśyat ³⁶
 tadvadhiṣṭām ⁴⁰ vibhor makhe ⁴¹
 Parikṣit-tanayaś cāpi
 Pauravo Janamejayaḥ
 dvir aśvamedham āhṛtya
 tato vājasaneyakam ⁴⁶
 pravartayitvā tad brahma
 trikharvī ⁴⁹ Janamejayaḥ 15
 kharvam ⁵⁰ Aśvaka⁵¹-mukhyānām
 kharvam ⁵² Aṅga-nivāsinām
 kharvam ⁵³ ca Madhyadeśānām
 trikharvī ⁵⁴ Janamejayaḥ
 viśādād ⁵⁶ brāhmaṇaiḥ sūrdham
 abhīṣataḥ ⁵⁷ kṣayam yayau
 tasya putrah Śatāniko
 balavān satya-vikramaḥ
 tataḥ sutam ⁶⁰ Śatānikam
 viprās tam abhyaśecayan ⁶². 20

³³ In dMt *pūrṇa*°.

³⁴ In fMt *dr̥ṣṭvā*°; cMt *iṣṭvā te 'smīn*;
 dMt *i tasmīn*; nMt *iti 'smīn*.

³⁵ In a'a'ceknMt *tam*; jMt *te*; hMt *tad*;
 tMt *tad[e]*.

³⁶ In gVā °*tah paśye* (for *paśyet*?).

³⁷ In fMt °*viśat*; cMt °*viśen*; dMt °*viśam*.

³⁸ In hMt *nāvitās*.

³⁹ In mpMt *tataḥ*.

⁴⁰ Sic: read *tadvad dhiṣṭām*?

⁴¹ In a'a'gVā *makhe*.

⁴² In ChdhpMt *so vai*, cenMt *yo*°: hMt
tataḥ śāpāt.

⁴³ In jMt *āhṛtya*; pMt *āruhya*.

⁴⁴ So ChdhjlmptMt; AefgkNmMt °*yakah*, cMt
 °*yikah*.

⁴⁵ In gVā °*yikam*.

⁴⁶ In chjMt *tat*°; fgMt *tān sarvān*.

⁴⁷ So bedefgklmpMt: ACmMt *ṛṣīm*; jMt
ṛṣer: hMt reads this half line *svavarcā* (for
kharvaś ca!) Janamejayaḥ.

⁴⁸ In cMt °*yikam*; efgjklMt °*yakah*.

⁴⁹ So Ca'a'bgVā; a'Vā °*khārvi*: with dia-
 lectic variation of *kh* and *ṣ*, gVā °*ṣarvī*,
 a'Vā °*suirvī*; dVā °*svarcā*; hVā °*svacī*.

⁵⁰ In ghVā *sarvam*.

⁵¹ In gVā and one MS of CVā *Aśmaka*.

⁵² In gVā *sarvam*.

⁵³ In ghVā *sarvam*.

⁵⁴ In dVā °*kharvā*; hVā °*khavī*; gVā
 °*ṣarvī*; kVā °*ṣadyī*.

⁵⁵ In bdpMt °*dam*; jMt °*do*.

⁵⁶ In a'kVā *viśādā*.

⁵⁷ In hVā °*śutah*.

⁵⁸ In jMt *su-*°; after this line jMt inserts
 Mt l. 6 on p. 4.

⁵⁹ In nMt °*jayā*; hMt *tatas te tu*.

⁶⁰ In dVā *tam tu*.

⁶¹ In hMt *viprā rāj*°, altered to *putram*
tasyābhyasecayat.

⁶² In dghVā *tasyābhye*°. CVā *tam abhya-*
secayat.

INDEX

This Index contains all the names mentioned in this work, except those that are obviously erroneous or untrustworthy. The following abbreviations are added to distinguish the names; and all names that are not so distinguished are the names of kings or princes :—

b = brahman.
c = country.
d = dynasty.
f = family.
k = king or prince.
mt = mountain.

p = people.
pat = patronymic.
q = queen.
r = river.
t = town.

Akarka ? 19.
Agnimitra 31, 70, 82.
Aṅga *p.* 32, 34, 49, 73.
Acala 16, 68.
Aja-ka 19, 68.
Ajaya 22, 69.
Ajātaśatru 21, 69.
Ajāmāna 40.
Adhisāmakaṣṇa 4.
Adhisīmakaṣṇa 1, 4, 5, 8, 10,
15, 65, 83; vii, ix, x.
Adhisomakaṣṇa 4.
Aniruddha 5.
Aṇiṣṭakarmaṇ 41, 86.
Anurakṣaka 10.
Anuvrata 16, 67.
Antaka 31, 70.
Antarīkṣa 10, 66, 82.
Andhaka 31.
Andhra *d.* 2, 35, 38-43, 45,
50, 51, 54, 58, 59, 61,
71-75, 79, 81, 85, 86;
xii, xiii, xv, xviii, xix,
xxvi, xxvii.
Andhraka 31, 70.
Andhrabhr̥tya *d.* 44-46, 72.

Apītaka 39.
Apilaka 39.
Apolavan 39.
Apratāpin, °tīpin 14, 67.
Abala 16.
abda xxiii.
Abhimanyu 1, 4, 65; viii, ix.
Amantrajit 11.
Amitrajit 10, 67.
Ayutāyus 14, 67.
Ayodhyā *t.* 10; v, ix, xii.
Arikta-karma, -varna 11.
Arin̄jaya 17, 68.
Ariṣṭakarma 36, 40, 41, 71.
Ariṣṭa-karṇi, -karman 11.
Arjuna 8, 66.
Arbuda *mt.* 54, 74.
Avanti *c, p.* 18, 54, 68.
†Aśaka *d.* 24.
Aśoka-vardhana 27, 28, 70,
84; xiv, xxii.
Aśmaka *d.* 24, 69.
Aśvamedha-ja, -datta 4, 65.
Aṣanda *p.* 47.
aṣṭa xxiii.
Aśimakaṣṇa 5, 65; ix.

Ahīnara 7, 66.
Ahuinara 7.
Ājaya 22.
Āti 40.
Andhra *d.* 2, 35, 45, 54, 58,
59, 72.
Āndhrabhr̥tya *d.* 45.
Āpādala- 39.
Apītaka 39.
Āpilaka 36, 39, 71, 86.
Apilavan, Āpol° 39.
Abhira *c, p.* 3, 41-47, 54,
65, 72, 74, 81.
Ādraka 31, 70.
Ārpālavan, Āryāl° 39.
Ārya *p.* 56, 74.
Āvantya *p.* 54, 74.
†Āvabhr̥tya *d.* 45.
Ikṣvāku, °ka *d.* 2, 9-12, 23,
65-67.
Ikhāku *d.* 37.
Indrapālita 29, 70.
Ilā *q* ? 2.
Ivīlaka 39.

Iṣuñjaya 17, 68.

Ukta 5.

U'grasena 4.

Utkala *c.* 2.

U'ttarā *q.* 4, 65.

Udathana ? 7.

U'dāmbhī ? 22.

U'dayana (1) 7, 66, 82 ; xxii :
(2) 22.

Udayāśva 22, 69.

U'dāyin 20, 22, 69.

U'dāna ? 7, 66.

U'dāsin ? 22, 69.

Urukriya 9.

Urukṣaya 9, 66.

Urva 7, 66.

U'sna 5, 66.

Urvya ? 7.

Rea 6, 66.

+Ekaliṅga *d.* 24.

Eḍa = Aḍa, 2.

Ela = Aila, 2.

expletives 77-82 ; xxiv.

Aikṣvākava *d.* 2.

Aikṣvāku, °ka *d.* 5, 8, 12
23, 66, 67, 69 ; v-x, x :
xxvii.

Aḍa *pat.* 2.

Aila *pat.* 1, 2, 12, 65, 67.

Odra *c.* *p.* 54, 73.

Kaṅka *d.* 45.

Kaccha *c.* 54.

Kaḍhu ? *p.* 52.

+Kaṇṭha = Kaṇva, 33.

+Kaṇṭhāyana = Kāṇvāyana
34.

Kaṇva *d.* 32-35, 38, 70-71.

Kaṇvāyana *d.* 34, 35, 38.

Kanaka 74.

Kanakāhvaya 54, 74.

Kauha 37.

Kardabhila = Gard^c, 45.

Karmaka ? *d.* 50.

Karmajit 15, 67.

Kali age 55-62, 74-76, 79 ;
v, viii-x, xiv-xvii, xxvii.

Kali-ka 25, 69.

Kalikilā ? *t.* 48.

Kaliṅga *c.* *p.* 54, 74.

Kaliṅga-ka *d.* 24, 69.

Kalinda ? *d.* 24.

Kalki 78.

Kaviratha 6, 66.

Kākakarma 21.

Kākavarṇa 21, 68.

Kāṅka = Kaṅka.

Kāṅcanakā *t.* 50, 73.

Kāñcī *t.* 55.

Kāṇva *d.* 32-35, 38, 70-71.

Kāṇvāyana *d.* 20, 22, 23,
33-35, 38, 50, 69, 71 ;
xv, xix, xxvi.

Kāntāpurī *t.* 53.

Kāntī-purī *t.* 53.

Kālaka ? *d.* 23, 85.

Kālatoyaka, °top°, *p.* 54, 73.

Kāliṅga *d.* 24.

Kāleya ? *d.* 23, 85.

Kāśaka *d.* 85.

Kāśaya *d.* 23.

Kāśī *t.* 69.

Kāśeya *d.* 23, 85.

Kāśmīra *c.* 55, 74.

Kinnara 10, 66.

Kinnarāśva 10, 66.

Kilāṅkila *d.* 48, 72 ; xii.

Kilikilā *t.* 48.

Kīrtivardhana 19.

Kuḍava ? 12, 67.

Kuṇḍaka 11, 67.

Kunāla 28, 29, 70.

Kuntala 36, 40, 71.

Kuru *d.* 23, 24, 69.

Kulaka 8, 11, 67.

Kulāla ? 28, 29.

Kulika 11.

Kuviratha 6, 66.

Kuśala (1) 25 : (2) 40.

Kuśāla ? 28.

Kusumapura *t.* 69.

Kusumāhvaya *t.* 22.

Kūrmajit ? 15.

Kṛta age 57, 63, 74, 76.

Kṛtajit ? 11.

Kṛtañjaya, °tīn°, 11, 67.

Kṛpa *b.* 4.

Kṛṣṇa 36, 37, 39, 71.

Kṛṣṇa (Viṣṇu) 61, 62, 75,
76, 79 ; vii, x.

Kelikila *d.* 48.

Kaikila *d.* 48.

Kailikila *d.* 48.

kaivarta *caste*, 3, 52, 65, 73.

Koj'ala *c.* 84.

Koṭilya = Kaṇṭilya, *b.* 26-28.

Komalā ? *t.* 51.

Kolikila *d.* 48.

Kośala (North), *see* Kosalā.

Kośalā *t.* 51, 73.

Kosala (North) *c.* *p.* 3, 9, 53,
54, 65, 73, 84.

Kosala (South) *p.* 65.

Kaucī ? *t.* 55.

Kauṭilya *b.* 26-28, 69, 70.

Kauṇḍilya *b.* 28.

Kauntī *t.* 55, 74.

Kaurava *d.* 4 ; v, viii, xxvii.

Kauśala *d.* 51.

Kauśalya *adj.* 84.

Kauśāmbī *t.* 5, 65 ; v, xv.

+Kruddhodana 11, 67.

kṣatra 2, 8, 25, 52, 53, 68,
69, 73, 87.

kṣatriya xvii.

Kṣatroja ? 21.

Kṣatraujas 21, 68.

Kṣama 15.

Kṣaya 9.

Kṣudraka (1) 8 : (2) 11, 67.

Kṣulika 11, 67.

Kṣettula ? 40.

Kṣetrajās 21.

Kṣetrajña 21, 68.

Kṣetradharman 21.

Kṣepaka ? 7.

Kṣema-ka 13, 15, 16, 67.
Kṣemaka 7, 8, 66, 77; vii.
Kṣemajit 21, 68.
Kṣemadhauvan ? 21.
Kṣemadharman, 20, 21, 68.
Kṣemabhūmi 32, 70.
Kṣemavarman 21.
Kṣemavid ? 21.
Kṣemārcis ? 21.
Kṣemya 15. •

Khaṇḍapāni 7, 66.
Kharoṣṭhī script 84, 85; xvi,
xxiii, xxvii.
Khemaka 77.

Ganges 5, 22, 53, 54, 65,
69, 73.
Gabhīra 51, 73.
Gāyā t. 2.
Garuḍa ? d. 46, 47.
Gardabhin d. 15, 46, 72, 81.
Gardabhila d. 44-46, 72.
Girivraja t. 14, 21, 67, 68.
Gupta d. 53, 54, 73; xii,
xiii, xxiv, xxv.
Gupta era xii-xvi.
Gurukṣepa 9.
Guruṇḍa d. 44, 46, 47, 72.
Guruṇḍikā bhāṣā 46.
Guha 54, 74.
Guha ? d. 53.
Gotamīputra 37, 42.
Gomati 42.
Gomatīputra 42.
Gautama (Buddha) vii.
Gautamīputra 36, 42, 71.
Gaunarda d. 3, 65.
Gaurakṣṇa ? 41.
Great Bear 59-62, 75.

Ghoṣa-vasu 32, 70.

Cakāra ? 41.
Cakora 36, 41, 71.
Cājaka ? 19.
Caḍaśrī ? 43.

Caḍaśrī 37.
Caṇḍaśrī 43, 72.
Catarapana 37.
Candragupta (Maurya) 27,
28, 70; vii.
Candragupta I (Gupta) xii.
Candrabhāgā r. 55, 74.
Candravija, °vijña, °vīrya ?
43.

Candraśrī, °śija, 36, 43.
Candrāmba, °śu, 49, 72.
Candrābha 49.
Campā-vatī t. 53, 54, 73, 74.
Calaka, °lika ? p. 2, 50.
Citraratha 5, 6, 66.
Citrākṣa 6.
Cilibaka ? 39.
Civilaka ? 39, 86.
Cālika p. 2, 65.
Caitraratha 6.
Caidyoparicara 13.

+Chismaka 38.
+Chośala = Kośala, 54.

Janaka 19, 68.
Janamejaya 1, 4, 65, 86-
88; ix, xiv, xix.
Janmejaya 4.
Jarāśandha 14, 67.
+Javana 45.
Jāhnavī r. 53.

Talaka 41, 71, 86.
Tāmralipta, Tāma°, c. p. 54,
74.
Tigma 7, 66.
Tigmātman 7, 66.
Timi 7.
Tilaka ? 19.
Tiṣya constell. 57, 74.
tu 78, 80, 81; xxvi.
Tukhāra d. 45-47, 72; xix.
+Tuṅga d. 32, 33, 85.
+Tuṅgakṛtya d. 34, 85.
Turuṣkaka, °kara, d. 46.

Tuṣāra d. 44-47, 72; xix,
xxvi.
Tuṣkara d. 45, 72.
Tūlika ? p. 2.
†Tōhaya d. 24.
Triharvin 88.
Tricakṣa 6, 66.
Trinetra 16, 68.
Trivakṣya 6.
Trairāja, °jya, c. 54.
Tvastṛ ? 5.

Dathasenaka 16.
Daṇḍapāni 7, 66.
Daṇḍaśrī 43, 72.
Dadhicikṣṇa ? 5.
Damitra 51.
Darbhaka 21, 69.
Darśaka 21, 69.
Davikorvī c. 55.
daśa xxiv.
Daśaratha 27-29, 70, 82.
Daśona ? 29, 70.
Dāpilaka 39.
Dāmadhanda ? 49.
Dārvikevī c. 55.
Dārvikorvī, Dāvi°, c. 55, 74.
Dāśaratha 29.
Divāka 9.
Divākara 5, 9, 10, 15, 66; ix.
Divānika 39.
Divārka 9, 66.
Divllaka 36, 39.
Durdamaṇa 7, 66.
Durbala ? 7.
Durmitra 51, 73.
Dūrva, °vi 7, 66.
Dr̥ḍhanetr 16.
Dr̥ḍhasena 13, 16, 68.
Devakorvī c. 55.
Devadharman 29, 70.
Devabhūti 32, 33.
Devabhūmi 32, 34, 70, 71.
Devarakṣita d. 54, 73.
Devavarman 29, 70.
Daivarakṣita d. 54.
Dyumnatsena 16, 68.

- Draupadī *q.* 4.
 Dviyajña ? 43.
 Dhanadharman 49, 72.
 Dhanastraya ? 11, 67.
 Dharma (1) 11: (2) 16, 68: (3) 49, 72.
 Dharmakṣetra 16.
 Dharmanetra 13, 16, 68.
 Dharmavarman 49.
 Dharmasūtra 16, 68.
 Dharmīn 11, 67, 82.
 Dhārmika 11.
 Dhūlika ? *p.* 2.
 Dhṛtimant 6, 66.
 Dhṛaka, Dhruka ? 31.
 Dhruvāśva 10, 66.
 Nakula 4.
 Nakhapāna 49, 72.
 Nakhavant 48, 72.
 Nanda 23, 25, 58, 62, 69: 74, 75; xix.
 Nanda *d.* 23-26, 50.
 Nandasāra 28.
 Nandiyāśus 49.
 Nandivardhana (1) 19, 68: (2) 22, 69.
 Nabhāra 51.
 Nabhīra 50, 73.
 Naramitra 7, 66.
 Nala 51, 73.
 Nahapāna 49; xxiv-xxvi.
 +Nahula 11.
 Nāka *d.* 53, 73.
 Nāga *d.* 49, 53, 72, 73; xii.
 Nāgasāhivaya *t.* 5.
 Nāga-siri 37.
 Nārāyana 34, 71.
 Nārīkṣṇa ? 41.
 +Nāhula 11.
 Nicakra 5.
 Nicakṣu 5, 6, 65; v.
 Nimi 7, 66.
 Nimittaka ? 7.
 Nirāmitra (1) 7, 66, 77: (2) 14, 67.
 Nirmātman 7.
 Nirvaktra ? 5, 65.
 Nirvṛti 13, 16, 68.
 Niścakru 5.
 Niśadha *c, p.* 51, 54, 73.
 Nīta ? 17, 68.
 Nīpa *d.* 3, 65.
 numerals xxiii-xxvi.
 Nurakṣaya ? 9.
 Nṛcaka ? 5.
 Nṛcakra 6.
 Nṛcakṣus 6, 66.
 Nṛpañjaya 7, 66.
 nrpati *k* ? 16.
 Nṛpaskanda 42.
 Nṛbandhu 6.
 Nṛbhṛta ? 16.
 Nṛvadhā ? 5.
 Netra 16, 68.
 Nemikṣṇa 41.
 Nemicakra 5, 65.
 Naimiṣa forest viii, x.
 Naimiṣika *p.* 54, 73.
 Naiśadha *p.* 51, 53, 54, 73.
 Naiśāda *p.* 54.
 Naurikṣṇa ? 41.
 Pakṣa ? 15.
 Pañcaka *p.* 52, 73.
 Pañcāla *c, d.* 3, 23, 65, 69.
 Paṭu ? *p.* 52.
 +Paṭumant 40.
 Paṭumitra ? *d.* 51, 73.
 Paṭṭa ? *p.* 52.
 Paṭṭamitra ? *d.* 51.
 +Paḍhumant 40.
 Paḍhumitra ? *d.* 51.
 Pattalaka 36, 41, 71, 86.
 Pattallaka 41.
 +Padumant 36.
 Padumāvi 40.
 Padumindra ? *d.* 51.
 Padmamitra ? *d.* 51, 73.
 Padmāvati *t.* 52, 73.
 Paraśu-Rāma *b.* 25, 69.
 Parāśara *b.* viii.
 Parīkṣit 1-4, 58, 59, 61, 62, 65, 74, 75, 87, 88; viii-x.
 Paritṛmava ? 6.
 Pariplava, °pluta 6, 66.
 Pariṣṇava 6, 66.
 Palika 18.
 Pāñcāla *d.* 23.
 Pāṇḍava *f.* 1, 12, 62, 75; v, viii, xxvii.
 Pāṇḍu 8, 66.
 pārāśava *caste*, 2, 65.
 Pāriplava ? 6.
 Pārtha 8.
 Pālaka 18, 19, 68.
 Pālī *lang.* 14, 78; xi, xxvii.
 Pucchaka ? 38.
 Puṇḍra-ka *p.* 54.
 Puttalaka ? 41.
 Putramitra ? 31.
 Putraya ? 7.
 Putrikāṣeṇa ? 41.
 Pundrumindra ? *d.* 51.
 Purañjaya (1) 7: (2) 18: (3) 49, 72.
 Purāṇas xvii, xxvii.
 Puraṇḍa ? *d.* 46, 47.
 purātana 8.
 purāvid 8.
 Purikā *t.* 49, 73.
 Purīkaṣeṇa 41, 71.
 Purisadata 37.
 Purīndrasena 36, 41.
 +Puriśabhīru, °bheru, °bhoru 41.
 +Puriśasena 41.
 Puruṇḍa ? *d.* 46, 47
 *Puruśasena 41.
 Pulaka, °lika 18, 68.
 Pulaka ? *p.* 50.
 Pulinda *p.* 2, 52, 65, 73.
 Pulinda-ka 32, 70.
 Pulindasena 41.
 +Pulimant 42.
 Pulihā ? *p.* 2.
 Pulumāyi 37.
 Pulumāvi 37.
 Puloman (°māvi ?) (1) 36

42, 71, 81: (2) 36, 43, 71.
 Pulomāci, °ārci ? 43.
 Pulomāri ? 43.
 Pulomāvi (1) 36, 40, 71: (2) 36, 43, 58, 72, 71.
 Puṣkara 10, 66.
 †Puṣkala 11, 67.
 Puṣpamitra ? 31.
 Puṣpamitra ? *d.* 51, 73. •
 Puṣya *constell.* 59, 75.
 Puṣyamitra 31, 70.
 Puṣyamitra *d.* 50, 51, 73.
 Pūru 8, 66.
 Pūrṇotsaṅga 36, 39, 71.
 Pūrṇosantu ? 39.
 Pūrvā Āṣādhā *const.* 62, 75.
 Paundra-ka *p.* 3, 54, 65, 74
 Paura ? 47.
 Paurava *d.* 1-8, 23, 65, 66, 77, 86, 88; v-x, xxvii.
 paurāṇika 8.
 Paurṇamāsa 39.
 Pauloma 58.
 Praṇitāśva 10.
 Prativyūha 9, 66.
 Prativyoma 9, 66.
 Pratikāśva, °kāsa 10, 66.
 Pratitāśva, °taka 10, 66.
 Pratīpa 59, 75.
 Pratīpāśva 10, 66.
 Prativya 10, 66.
 Pradyota 18, 68; vii.
 Pradyota *d.* 17-19, 23, 68.
 Pradyotana *d.* 19.
 Prabhu 15.
 Prayāga *t.* 53, 54, 73; xii.
 Pravarasena 48.
 Pravira-ka 48, 50, 73.
 Pravillasena 41.
 Prasenañjit 11, 67.
 Prādyota *d.* 19.
 braṭaka 42.
 Bandhupālita 29, 70.
 bard xi, xxvii.
 Barhis 11.

bahavo ? 42.
 Bahukarmaka ? 15, 67.
 Bārhadbala *d.* 12.
 Bārhadratha *d.* 5, 13-18, 23, 67, 68, 78; v-x, xxvii.
 Bālaka 18, 19, 68.
 Bālhika *d.* 2, 50.
 Bāhula 11, 67.
 Bāhlīka *d.* 50, 73.
 Buddha vii.
 Buddhasiṃha vii.
 Br̥hatkarmān 15, 67.
 Br̥hatkṣaya 9, 66.
 Br̥hatsena 15, 67.
 Br̥hadaśva 10, 66.
 Br̥hadbala 9, 12, 66, 67.
 Br̥hadbhṛāja 11, 67.
 Br̥hadraja 9.
 Br̥hadratha (1) 13: (2) 7, 66: (3) 9: (4) 17 note 4: (5) 28, 29, 31, 70.
 Br̥hadratha *d.* 13-18.
 Br̥hadrāja, °vāja 11, 67.
 Br̥haspati *planet* 57, 74.
 Benares 21, 68.
 Brāhmī *script* 85; xvi.
 Bhakṣyaka *p.* 54.
 Bhagavata 30, 32.
 Bhagendra 40.
 Bhadra-ka 31, 70.
 Bhadrāsāra 28.
 †Bharadvāja 11.
 Bharaut *t.* 48.
 Bhaviṣya *Purāṇa* 2, 12, 13, 59, 65, 75; *Introdu.*
 Bhāgavata *king* (1) 30, 70: (2) 30, 32.
 †Bhāturatha 10.
 Bhānu 9, 66.
 Bhānumant 10, 66.
 Bhānuratha 10, 66.
 Bhārata *battle* 14, 67.
 Bhārgava *b.* 25.
 Bhīmasena 4.
 Bhuvata ? 16, 67.
 Bhūtananda-na 49.

Bhūtinanda 49, 73.
 Bhūtimitra 34.
 Bhūmitra 34.
 Bhūminanda 49.
 Bhūmiputra 34.
 Bhūmimitra 34, 71.
 Bhūri (1) 5, 66: (2) 15.
 Bhokṣyaka *p.* 54, 74.
 Bhogavardhana *t.* 49.
 Bhogin 49, 72.
 Bhojaka *p.* 54, 74.
 Magadha *c.* *p.* 23, 53, 54, 67, 73; v, ix-xii, xvi, xxvii.
 Maghā *constell.* 59, 61, 62, 75.
 Maṇidhāna-ka *d.* 54, 73.
 Maṇidhānya *d.* 54, 73; xii.
 Maṇidhāra-ka *d.* 54, 73.
 Maṇḍalaka 41.
 Mathurā *t.* 53, 73; xvi.
 Madra 31.
 Madra-ka *p.* 52, 73.
 Madhuanandana 32.
 Madhuanandi 49, 73.
 Madhyadeśa 10; xvi.
 Mamayā *t d.* 46.
 Manuṣin 15.
 Manu 2, 51, 67, 73, 77.
 Manudeva 10.
 Mantalaka 36, 41, 71, 85.
 Mandulaka 41.
 Maruṇḍa *d.* 46, 47.
 Marudeva 10, 66.
 Maranandana 32.
 Marubhūmi *c.* 54, 71.
 Mallakarni 39.
 Mahatsena 16.
 Mahākosala *c.* 65.
 Mahādeva 58, 74.
 Mahānanda 58, 74; vii.
 Mahānandi-n 22, 25, 69.
 Mahāpadma 23-26, 58, 69, 74, 75.
 Mahābhārata 4.
 Mahārāṣṭri bhāṣā 46.
 Mahāsena 16.

Mahiṣa, °sya *p.* 51, 51, 74.
 Mahiṣatī *t.* 50.
 Mahiṣi *p.* 51, 73.
 Mahiṣika *p.* 54.
 Mahinara 7, 66.
 Mahineta 16, 68.
 Mahendra 40.
 Mahendra *mt.* 54, 74.
 Māgadha *p.* 14, 52, 51, 73,
 84; x, xi.
 Māgadhā *t.* 52.
 Māgadhi *Prakrit* xi, xxvii.
 Māgadheya 14.
 Mādhariputa 37.
 Mānava *d.* 12.
 Mārjari 14, 67.
 Mālakarni 39.
 Māladhānya *d.* 54.
 Mālava *p.* 54, 74.
 Mālīka ? 18.
 Māhiṣatī *t.* 50.
 Māhiṣi *p.* 51.
 Māhiṣmatī *t.* 50.
 Māhendraabhauna *c.* 54.
 Māheya *p.* 54.
 Mikalā ? *t.* 51.
 Mitra 14.
 minstrel xi, xxvii.
 Mukhābāṇa 6.
 Muṇḍa *d.* 46, 72.
 Munaya 7.
 Munika 18, 68.
 Muruṇḍa *d.* 44-47, 72, 81.
 Mulindaka 32.
 Muṣita *p.* 54.
 Mūrjaka, Mj^o ? 19.
 Mālīka ? *p.* 2.
 Mūsika, Mṛs^o *p.* 54, 74.
 Mṛgendra 36, 40, 71.
 Mṛdu 7, 66.
 Mekala *p.* 3, 65.
 Mekala *d.* 51.
 Mekalā *t.* 51, 73.
 Megha *d.* 51, 73.
 Meghasvāti (1) 36, 40, 71 :
 (2) 36, 40.
 Meghasvāmin 40.

Medasīras 42.
 Medya ? *d.* 51.
 Medhasvāti 40.
 Medhāvin 6, 7, 66.
 Medhunandi 49.
 Mevabhūmi *c.* 54.
 Maitreya *b.* viii.
 Maithila *d.* 24, 69, 79.
 Mona ? *d.* 46.
 Momegha ? 32.
 Moon 57, 74.
 Mauna *d.* 45-48, 72, 81 ;
 xxv.
 Maurya *d.* 26-30, 50, 69, 70,
 84 ; xix.
 Maula ? *d.* 46.
 Mleccha *racas* 3, 4 17, 55,
 56, 65, 72, 74, 80 ; xxi,
 xxvi.
 Yakṣa ? 16.
 Yajuhērī ? 42.
 Yajñamitra 32.
 Yajñaśrī 36, 37, 42, 71 ; xiii,
 xxvii.
 Yaṇa 37.
 Yadu-ka *p.* 52, 73.
 †Yadumāvi 40.
 Yavana *d.* 2, 3, 44-46, 48,
 65, 72, 82 ; xii, xxii.
 Yavana *race* 2, 3, 56, 74.
 Yaśonandi 49, 73.
 Yājñavalkya *b.* 4.
 Yāvana *d.* 45.
 Yāvanī bhāṣā 46.
 Yudaka ? *p.* 54.
 Yudhiṣṭhira 61, 75 ; ix, x.
 Yona *d.* 82.
 Yomegha ? 32, 70.
 Yauna *d.* 46, 53.
 Rapaka 12, 67.
 Raṇaṇjaya 8, 11, 67.
 Raṇejaya 11.
 Rathājaya 11.
 Rājaka 19, 68.
 Rājāda ? 41.

†Rātula 11, 67.
 Rāndha ? *d.* 53.
 Rāma *b.* 25, 69.
 Rāmacandra 49, 72.
 Rāhula 11, 67.
 Ripu ? 15.
 Ripukā ? *t.* 49.
 Ripuñjaya (1) 15 : (2) 17,
 18, 68.
 †Ritihotra *d.* 18, 24.
 Ruca 6, 66.
 †Ruruṣaya 9.
 Lambodara 36, 39, 71.
 †Lāṅgala 11, 67.
 Vaiṣṇaka 22, 69.
 Vakhampita 49.
 Vagara 49.
 Vaṅgara, °gava 49, 73.
 Vaṅgiri 49, 73.
 Vajramitra (1) 31 : (2) 32, 70.
 vaṭaka 42.
 Vaṇḍaśrī ? 43.
 Vatsa ? 9, 66.
 Vatsadroha 9, 66.
 Vatsavyūha, °vṛddha 9, 66.
 Vandamśa ? 49.
 vandin xi.
 Varāṅga 49, 73.
 Varukarmaṇa ? 18.
 Vartivardhana ? 19, 68.
 Vasu 13.
 Vasujyestha 31, 70.
 Vasudāna, °dāman 7, 66. ✓
 Vasudeva 33, 70.
 Va-sudeva (Kṛṣṇa's father) 61,
 75.
 Vasudhāman ? 7.
 Vasuputra 31.
 Vasumitra 31, 70.
 Vasuśreṣṭha 31.
 Vahinara 7, 66.
 Vākātaka *c.* 45.
 Vājasaneya-ka *doctrine* 1, 87,
 88.
 Vāmacandra 49.

Vāyumiṭra 31.
 Vārūnāsi *t.* 21.
 †Vārisāra 28
 Vārbhadratha *d.* 13-17.
 Vālhika *d.* 50.
 Vāsīthīputa 37.
 Vāsudeva 33.
 Vāhika *p.* 50.
 Vāhika *t p.* 50.
 Vāhika *d.* 50.
 vi xxiv.
 Viṁśaja 49, 73.
 Vikala ? 39.
 Vikramitra 32.
 Vicakṣus 5.
 Vijaya 36, 43, 72.
 Viḍūṛatha 12.
 Viḍiśā *t.* 48, 72; x.
 Viḍūra *c, mt.* 51.
 †Viḍmīsāra 21.
 †Viḍmīsāra 21, 70.
 Vinatāśva *c.* 2.
 Vinaya 43.
 Vindusāra 28; xxiii.
 †Vindusena 21.
 Vindhya *d.* 50, 73.
 Vindhyaśakti 45, 48-50, 72, 73.
 Vindhyaśena 21.
 Vipra 15, 67.
 Vibhu 15, 67.
 Vimbiśāra 21, 68.
 Vimvasphāṭi 52.
 Virāṭa 65.
 Virakṣa ? 6.
 Vivakṣu 5, 65.
 †Vivisāra 21.
 Viśākhabhūpa, °rūpa 19.
 Viśākhayūpa 18, 19, 68.
 Viśāṣayūpa, °sūya 19.
 Viśvajit 17, 68.
 Viśvanātha *god* 25.
 Viśvasphāṇi 23, 24, 27, 30, 33, 35, 52, 73; xix.
 Viśvasphaṭika, °sphāci, °sphā-
 ṭi, °sphīṇi, °sphīti, °sphūrji,
 °sphūrti 52.

Viṣṇumant 6.
 Vitahotra *d.* 3, 18, 24.
 Vitihotra *d.* 3, 18, 24, 65, 68, 69.
 Virajit 17, 68.
 Virasena 4.
 Vūlika ? *p.* 2.
 Vrttimant 6.
 Vṛṣṭimant 6, 66.
 Vṛṣṇimant 5, 66.
 Vṛhatkarman 15.
 Vṛhatkṣaṇa ? 9.
 Vṛhatsena 16.
 Vṛhadaśva 29, 70.
 Vṛhadbala 9.
 Vṛhadratha, *see* Brhad°.
 Vṛhuñjaya 11.
 Vēdiśā 48.
 Vaidiśa-ka *p.* 3, 49, 65, 73.
 Vaidūra, °rya *mt.* 51, 73.
 Vairāṭi *pat.* 4.
 Vaiśampāyana *b.* 1, 86-88.
 Vyāsa *b.* 2, 65; viii, xvii, xviii, xxvii.
 Vrajabhāṣā 46.
 Vṛāta ? 11, 67.
 vrāṭya *castes* 54, 55, 74.
 Śaka *d.* 2, 3, (24, note ¹⁶), 41-46, 52, 65, 72, 81; xxiv, xxvi.
 Śaka *era* xxiv, xxv.
 Śakavarṇa 21, 68.
 Śakya *d.* 45.
 Śakya 8, 11.
 Śakyāmāna 51, 73.
 †Śaṅka 32, 80.
 Śaṅkamāna 51, 73.
 Śaṅkukarṇa 4.
 Śata xxiv.
 Śatānūdhānu 29, 70.
 Śatāmyajña 15.
 Śatajit 11.
 Śatañjaya 15.
 Śatadhanu 29, 70.
 Śatadhanvan 28, 29, 70.
 Śatadhara 29.

Śatānūka (1) 4, 65, 88; (2) 4; (3) 4, 7, 66.
 Śatrujayin *t.* 16.
 Śanaka 18.
 Śabara *p.* 3.
 Śama 16, 68.
 Śarmamitra 14.
 Śavara *p.* 3, 65.
 Śākya 8, 11, 67.
 Śākya *d.* 45.
 Śakyāmāna 51.
 Śakyamuni vii.
 Śākyaśimha vii.
 Śātakarṇi 36-43, 71, 72.
 Śātikarṇa 37.
 Śāntakarṇi 39.
 Śāntikarṇa 37.
 Śāliśūka 27, 29, 70, 84; xx.
 †Śipraka 38, 71.
 Śivakhada 37.
 Śivaśrī 36, 37, 42, 71, 81.
 Śivaskanda, °dha 36, 42, 71.
 Śivasvāti 36, 42, 71.
 Śivasvāmin 42.
 Śiśika 49.
 Śiśuka (1) 38, 71; (2) 49, 50, 73.
 †Śiśunāka 19, 21-23, 80.
 †Śiśunāka *d.* 22, 23, 80.
 Śiśunāga 21, 68, 69, 80.
 Śiśunāga *d.* 20-23, 80; xix.
 Śiśumandī 49, 73.
 Śukra 49, 50.
 Śukra *planet* 57.
 †Śuṅka *d.* 30, 49, 80.
 Śuṅga *d.* 27, 28, 30-34, 38, 49, 50, 70, 71, 73, 80, 85; xix.
 Śuṅgabhrtya *d.* 33, 34, 71, 85.
 Śuci 15, 67.
 Śucidratha 6, 66.
 Śuciratha 6.
 Śuddhoda 11.
 Śuddhodana 8, 11, 67; vii.
 Śuddhaudana 11.
 Śunaka 18, 68.
 Śuśrūma 16.

- Śūdra *p.* 54, 74.
 śūdra *caste* 2, 8, 23, 25, 54, 55, 65, 69, 74.
 Śūra *p.* 54, 55, 74.
 Śūrasena *d.* 24, 69.
 †Śrīga *d.* 32, 34, 38, 39.
 Śeṣika *p.* 54.
 Śeṣa 49, 72.
 Śaiśara *p.* 51, 54.
 Śaiśika, °ja *p.* 54, 73.
 Śaiśita *p.* 54, 73.
 †Śaiśunāka *d.* 22, 23.
 Śaiśunāga *d.* 22, 69.
 Śauiga 71.
 Śaunaka *b.* 4.
 Śausita *p.* 54.
 Śrīpārvatiya *d.* 44, 46, 72.
 Śrī-Mallakarni 39.
 Śrī-Śatakarni 36, 37, 39, 71.
 Śrī-Śantakarni, °ṇa 39.
 Śrutāñjaya 15, 67.
 Śrutavant 14, 67.
 Śrutaśravas 14, 67.
 Śrutasena 4.
 Saipadi 29.
 Saigata 29.
 Saigha ? 40.
 Sañjaya 11, 67.
 Sati 37.
 Satyajit 17, 67.
 Sada 37.
 Sadakaṇi 37.
 Sadakhada ? 37.
 Sadācandra 49, 72.
 Sadānika 7.
 sapta xxiii.
 †Saptaka 41, 71.
 Saptajit ? 17.
 Saptarṣi *constell. and cycle* 59-62 ; xv.
 Sama 16.
 Samakarni 42, 43.
 samā xxiii.
 Samādhi 14.
 Samābhāga ? 32, 70.
 Samudragupta xii, xiii.
 Samprati 28, 29, 70.
 Sarvajit 17.
 †Salomadhi 43.
 Sahadeva (1) 10, 66 : (2) 10, 66 : (3) 14, 67.
 Sahalya 25, 69.
 sahasrāṇi xxvi.
 Sahasrāṇika 4.
 †Sahānandi 22, 69.
 Śaketa, °tu *t.* 53, 73 ; xii.
 Śakṣonāmān ? 51.
 Sāñchi *t.* 48.
 Sātakani 37.
 Sātavāhana 37.
 Sāmakarni 42, 43.
 Sāmādhi 14.
 Siddhārtha 9, 11, 67.
 Sindhu *r.* 55, 74.
 Sindhuka 38, 71.
 Simuka 36-38, 71, 81 ; xxvi.
 Siri-mata 37.
 Siri Yaña 37.
 Sirivira 37.
 Sivamakha 37.
 Sivasir 42.
 Sukalpa 25, 69.
 Sukulpa, °lya 25.
 Sukṛta 15, 67.
 Sukṣatra (1) 10 : (2) 15, 67.
 Sukhābala 6, 66.
 Sukhinandi 49.
 Sukhībala, °nala 6, 66.
 Sukhīlava 6.
 Sukheṇa 6.
 Suṅgaśrī 43.
 Sucāla 16, 68.
 Sujyestha 31, 70, 81.
 Sutapas (1) 6, 66 : (2) 10, 66.
 Sūtirtha 6.
 Sudānaka 7, 66.
 Sudāsa 7, 66.
 †Sudeva 33.
 Sudyumna 2, 65.
 Sudyota 18.
 Sudhanvan 16.
 Sudharman 34.
 Sun 57, 74.
 Sunakṣatra (1) 10, 66 : (2) 15, 67.
 Sunandana 41.
 Sunaya 6, 7, 66.
 Sunika 18, 68.
 Sunidharma *d.* 3, 65.
 Sunīta ? 17, 68.
 Sunītha (1) 6, 66 : (2) 17, 68.
 Sunetra (1) 16, 67 : (2) 16 : (3) 17, 68.
 Sundara 36, 41, 71.
 Sundhara 41.
 Suparṇa 10, 66.
 Suprañita 10.
 Supratāpa 10.
 Supratika (1) 10, 66 : (2) 50, 73.
 Supratita 10, 66.
 Supratipa 10, 66.
 Subāla 16, 68.
 Sumati (1) 16, 68 : (2) 26.
 Sumātya 26, 69.
 Sumālya 25, 26, 69.
 Sumitra (1) 10, 67 : (2) 12, 67 : (3) 15 : (4) 31.
 Suyāśas 27-29, 70.
 Surakṣa 16, 67.
 Suratha (1) 7 : (2) 8, 11, 12, 67.
 Surāṣṭra *c.* 54.
 Suruṇḍa *d.* 46, 47.
 †Suloman 42.
 Suvata 16.
 Suvarṇa 10, 66.
 Suvidratha 6.
 Suvrata (1) 13, 16, 67 : (2) 16, 68 : (3) 11.
 Suśarman 34, 38, 71 ; xx.
 Suśrama 13, 16, 68.
 Suśruta 16.
 Suśinandi 49, 73.
 Suṣeṇa (1) 6, 66 : (2) 10, 66, 82.
 Suhma *c.* 54.
 sūta xi.

- Sūrya 9.
 Sūryaka 19, 68.
 Sūrya-vaiṇśa 58.
 Śṛtañjaya 15.
 Senajit 11, 67.
 Senājit 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17,
 67; ix.
 Seven Ṛṣis 75.
 Soma-vaiṇśa 12, 58.
 Somaśarma 29.
 Somādi, °dhi 14, 67.
 Somāpi, °mi 14, 67.
 Sauryumna *race* 2.
 Saurāṣṭra *p.* 54, 55, 74.
 Skandasvāti 36, 40, 71.
 Skandhastambhi 36, 39, 71.
 †Strimitra *d.* 51.
 Strirājya, °rāṣṭra 54, 71.
 Svasphraka *d.* 3, 65.
 Svāti 36, 40, 71, 81.
 Svātikarṇa 37, 40, 71.
 Svātikona 37, 40.
 Svātivarṇa 36, 40, 71.
 Svātiṣeṇa 40.
 Hari 7, 66.
 Haritāśva *c.* 2.
 Hastināpura *t.* 5, 65; v.
 Hāla 36, 41, 71, 85.
 Hāleya 41, 86.
 Hūṇa *d.* 45-47, 72; xxv.
 Haihaya *d.* 23, 69, 77.

